

301

# MYLD AND

IVST DEFENCE OF CERTEYNE ARGUMENTS, AT THE LAST SESSION OF Parliament directed to that most Honorable High Court, in behalfe of the Ministers suspended and *deprived &c : for not Subscribing and Conforming themselves etc.*

AGAINST AN INTEMPERAT AND VNIVST CONSIDERATION of them by *M. Gabril Powell*. The chiefe and generall contents wherof are breesely layd downe immediatly after the Epistle.

G. Powell.

*Let there be no strife I praye thee betweene thee and me, for we be brethren: Gen. 30: 8.*

*Reply.*

The wordes of his mouth were softer then butter, yet warre is in his heart: His wordes were more gentle then oyle, yet they were swords. Psal: 55: 21.

Out of one mouth proceedeth blessing & cursing: my brethren these things ought not to be so. Iames 3. 10.

My little children let vs not loue in word neyther in tongue only, but in deed and in truth: 1 Ioh: 3: 18:

Imprinted, 1606.



392





TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE AND  
MOST CHRISTIAN HIGH COURT OF PAR-  
liament which lately was, and shortly agayne is to be  
assembled.

**R**ight Honorable and most Christian Senat, as at your last  
Session, there were certayne Arguments directed unto  
You for the quickening of your godly Zeale to speake,  
not oncly boldly, but also in all humilitie to the Kings most excel-  
lent Maiestie, for the Ministers suspended and deprived for not  
Subscribing and Conformyng themselues to some present Consti-  
tutions, and as ye did graciously accept of the sayd Arguments,  
and most worthily acquite your selues to the utmost of your po-  
wers, touching the matter pleaded for by them: so now vouchsafe  
(I most humblie beseech you) the like favorable acceptance of a  
sober, modest, and iust defence of the same Arguments against a  
late uncharitable, unchristian, bitter, calumnious, and cavilling  
answer, published under the title of A consideration of them by  
M. Gabril Powel. I am bold in steed of the author himselfe of  
the Arguments, to take the defence of them upon me, and to pre-  
sent them to your Honors, because M. Powel himselfe in his said  
pretended answer unto them, hath so often referred the iudgment  
of the Arguments of his consideration of them, and of the  
whole cause, to your most graue and gracious company. Yea, there  
is nothing that I am more willing unto, or which I doe more ear-  
nestly desire, then that the cause betwixt M. Powel and all those  
for whom he pleadeth on the one parte, and the author of the Ar-  
guments ana me the defendant with all other in whose behalfe we  
speake on the other parte, might be iudicioussy and equally heard  
at the barre of your most Christian Court. But the truth is, be-  
cause





The Epistle Dedicatorie.

304

cause we desire and endeavor this, hinc illæ lacrymæ. Hence is their chiefe hatred of us, their great contention with us, and their bitter writing against us. Notwithstanding though now we be unjustly charged as writing from Cimerian darknes, for concealing our names; yet if publike libertie might be granted to both parts, to stand before your iudgment seat, there freely to plead & debate the cause by the word of God, and that neither the worldly might and pompe of our adversaries, nor our meannes and basenes might be respected, but the truth it selfe simplie considered and regarded, we would also account it as a singular mercy of God, and as a special favor of you towards us in that behalfe.

In the meane time, I doe in all humility referr the Argumēts, together with the defence of them to your graue and iudicious consideration against your next meeting in Parliament: not doubting but that the equitie of the cause, and the innocencie of our selues will therby be so apparant unto you, that though before some perhaps among you, did thinke the one not to be so iust, and the other not so free from all blame, yet when ye shall agayne assemble, ye will all with one mouth as one man, both iustifie the cause, and also speake more then ever before ye haue don, for favor unto vs, and to our people: betwixt whom the bond before made by the Church, and sealed by the holy Ghost in the effects of our Ministry, cannot by any Lordly Episcopall severity be iustly dissolved.

I doe further likewise humbly craue your Honorable lawfull favor more specially towards me (if at any time I shall be discovered) against all those that shall not well brooke the sober and modest taxing of their corruptions in this defence: especially considering the same is not done of any contentious minde; but onely in love of the truth, to support it against those that deprave it: and in regard of our owne good names, to mainteyne our owne innocency against those that under the name of brethren, doe most unbrotherly disgrace us.

More.



## The Epistle Dedicatorie.

Moreover, if any thing in this defence following, or in the Arguments themselves, by the malice of any shalbe wrested and perverted, thereby also to wrest and pervert the law to the danger of the severall authors of the one or the other (being found out) may it likewise please you, in all lawfull and righteous manner to put forth your selues for protection of the sayd authors: as chiefly because such wresting of words and perverting of iudgment, may procure Gods iudgments against themselves that shall so offend, and against the whole land; so likewise because to speake in such matters and for such persons (whatsoever the answerer saith to the contrary) shall not only bring much peace & comfort to such speakers themselves, but shall also be beneficiall to the whole land, as is shewed in the Arguments, nothing infringed or weakened, by all M. Powels opposition unto them.

Yea let this consideration be a third reason to moue you the rather so to speake, viz. that if one man had the diuinity & knowledge in law, as also all other learning, wit and wisdom of all men, yet could he not so warily and circumspectly write in all things, but that some wrangler or other (instructed and set a worke by the serpent, that is more subtile, not onely then all beasts, but also then all men now living on the earth) might and would find some matter or other, wherby to molest and trouble him.

I had thought much more to haue enlarged this my preface, but the prolixity of the defence it selfe much exceeded my first purpos, I will here conclude, both humbly and with all thanks to God & to your selues acknowledging your most religious & gracious endeavors at your last Session for the cause and for the persons pleaded for in the argumētts; and most heartily & instantly likewise praying for you & yours as Nehemiah prayed for himselfe: viz. that God in goodnes would remember you (and yours) according to all that ye haue doone for vs: and that he will never wpe out your kindnes that ye haue shewed on the house of your God, and on the officers thereof.



# A BREEFE NOTE OF SOME OF THE CHIEFE

generall poynts handled in this defence following.

**T**hat the author of the Arguments is falsly accused to impute any dissembling or equivocating to the Kings most excellent Majestty, but that in all things he hath conceived and written most reverently, Christianly and duefully of his Majesttie.

2 That he is as vnruefully charged with any vndutifull speeches against the Nobility, or any other that haue obeyed his Majestties proceedings

3 That the Ministers pleaded for are not refratary, superstitious, or schismaticall: neyther contronters of the Magistrat, or troublers of the state, but that these and other the like imputations doe rather belong to their accusers

4 That our Churches of England are in nothing so glorious state as is pretended by *M. Powel*, and other prelaticall persons but rather in divers respects, and for divers parts thereof in lamentable condition.

5 That the late proceedings of the Prelats against such Ministers for not subscribing, conforming etc: & that many of the late *Canons* or cōstitutions are contrary to the word of God, & the lawes of this Realme.

6 That the oth likewise *Ex Officio* is repugnant to the lawes of this Realme: yea abrogated by them, & only inforced by forreyne Canons.

7 That the obedience & loyaltie of the Ministers for conscience of Gods word not conforming themselves, is as good as of the greatest conformitans, yea that their not conforming themselves in that respect, maketh more then conformity for the good & safetie of his Majesttie

8 That the Considerer of the arguments, in his inconsiderat consideration of them, hath most unreverently and undutifully censured the High Court of Parliament, for their late most religious indeavors in behalfe of the Ministers pleaded for in the sayd Arguments.

9 That the Ministers soe deprived, doe not forsake their callings.

10 That although the number of the Ministers soe deprived be but smal in comparison of other, yet the deprivation of them & the loss of their Ministry is dangerous for the whole Church in this kingdome.

11 That the Considerer of the arguments oft times offendeth in those things which unjustly he objecteth unto the author of the arguments: viz: in sophistications in generall, and particularly in begging of the question: as also in equivocations, & in vayne repetitions of the same things for encreasing of his volume: and lastly in contradicting himselfe, yea sometyme in one and the same place.

12 That he and other the Prelats most striving for conformity, doe attribut more to conformitie, then to any more materiall & principall duties of the Ministry expressly commanded by God.





# A DEFENCE OF THE ARGUMENTES

Lately directed to the High Court of Parliament for  
*the Ministers silenced ect, against the answer unto them*  
 by M. Gabriel Powell.



Al though the late answer of *M. Powell* to the Arguments in the title mentioned, for moment of matter be not such, that either any disgrace of the sayd Arguments or of the cause it selfe, with any wise and judicious reader, neede to be feared thereby; or that therefore the said answer should haue reply thereunto: yet for their sake that are not so judicious; and that neither the answerer himselfe, neither any other by our silence may haue any cause to insult and triumph, as having wonne some great field, and gotten some worthy victory, I haue presumed to take upon me the replying thereunto, instead of the author himselfe.

Heerein (notwithstanding the answerer his scoffing at our triobular Pamphlets) I will labour as much as I may for brevity, that so the Christian reader may the lesse be hindred from his other waighty affayres. For this cause I nether will reply to the whole answer, neither will cause the sayd answer to be wholly reprinted, but will onely most breifly collect such things, as may most seeme to requyre reply; but yet with such faithfullnes, that the answerer shall haue no just cause to complayne of the sayd collections, as unjust, or not agreeyng to his owne words. The marginall notes I will reply unto by themselves, and

A

that



that according to the letters prefixed unto them: and the rest that he writeth, in that order they are by himselfe set downe.

But before I proceede any further, let me admonish *M. Powel* of one fault in him, and common to many other of that side; that is to attribute that to all of vs which is done by any one. I meane in things which they thinke to be blameable. These Arguments were written by one alone, yet whatsoever he can by hooke or crooke gather as worthy of rebuke or shew of rebuke, that he imputeth to all that craue any favour? In good thigs they deale not so, but that which is well sayd or done by one is imputed to one onely, so that the rest fare not the better thereby. My humble desire therefore is, that howsoever thes men deale with vs, yet that other would deale otherwise. viz. That if there be any thing blamable in the Arguments, or in any other one mans writing of our side, it may be taken as the fault onely of one, and not imputed to all. Especially let this be considered, when there is no fault at all, but onely by surmise, and upon uncharitable misconstruyng & wresting of a mans words. It was the fault of *Saule*, for the supposed offence of *Abimelech*, to kill both him, and also all the rest of the Lords Preists. It was the sinne of *Haman*, for the suspected pride of *Mordecai* in not bowyng unto him, to hate him & all the Iewes, and to plot and contriue the ruine of them all. So the Apostle noteth it as a fault of the heathen, *that knew not God, and were given over to a reprobate mind, to take all things in the evill part.* Rom. 1. 24. Let this therefore be the sinne of such wicked men, but let all true Christians that loue and feare the Lord, be free thereof. Now to proceed, I will beginne with the preface.



**T** Ouching the preface there being not much therein which is not afterward mentioned in the rest of the booke, I may the more cursorily passe and rune it over.

The first poynt here to be observed, as also in the place of scripture subscribed to the title *Gen. 13. 8.* Is that he calleth vs *brethren*, as if he did so account and regard us. Notwithstanding whether he doe any otherwise, or with any other minde so call us, then only as *Ioab* called *Amasa* his brother with his mouth, and yet at the same instant killed him with his hand. *2 Sam. 20. 9.* I leaue it to be judged by his opposition to our petition, by his most unchristian, & vncharitable raylings, revilyngs, reproches & scoffs, as also by his most unjust collections; as directly contrary to the words, & much more to the meaning of the author of the said Arguments, so likewise to all reason, & common sense. Sharpnes & bitternes are the common weapons and principall armour of that side, which is an evidence of the badnes of their cause, and no lesse testimony of the goodnes of ours. For truth and righteousness can support themselves without any such meanes. Notwithstanding in this kind, this answerer hath farre exceeded many other, yea, he may well be acknowledged to haue wonne the spurres from many other. They commonly object this fault unto us, and it may be some one of his private motion and disposition, doth a litle somtyme offend this way, to the greife of the rest that favor the cause. But if all speeches of that kind that haue ever been used by any of our side, were gathered into one (truely and without any wresting) they would not amount to the number proportionably, that is apparant and evident in this answer.

The which fault is so much the greater, because the ar-



310  
4  
guments are propounded with alltemperance, & without any just occasion to provoke him, except it be as a weak stomach is sicke with the best and most wholesome meate. Notwithstanding I do the lesse marveile hereat, because as the more extreame the loue of *Amnon* was towardes *Tamar* at the first, and the more extreame also his hatred against her afterward, 2. *Sam.* 13. 15. So this is often to be observed, that such as sometime haue been most hott in dislike of the corruptions of our Church, they changing their minds and for preferment conformyng themselves, haue become more bitter and heauie aduersaries, then any of those that were never other the conformable men. But was *M. Povel* at any time of such a minde? Yea certainly within these few yeares he was so over strong, that he called the Communion booke a Mass booke. At another time likewise being at a Church, and hearing the Latiny, he rose up saying, come let us goe, what shall we now heare conjuring? So likewise the time hath been when some other (now very conformable) haue publikly in pulpit (I will not say in my hearing) to the disgrace of the Bishops sayd, *If ever the Bishops doe good in the Parliament house let me be damned*. Many other the like instances might be named, But I regard brevity. These things wilbe justified. Did any of vs ever so behaue our selues? If we had, we might be justly blamed in that behalfe. But I will presse this poynt no further. I haue the rather reported this, for the better answer of the matter of giddines afterward by him objected unto us.

2 The next poynt in the preface, is, that he chargeth us with emulation of forreyne novelty.

*Ans.* Neither noveltie, nor forreyne. We desire nothing, wherein we haue not proved our desires by such Arguments



ments of Gods word ( the best antiquitie, and besides which, the more auncient any thing is, the more rotten is the same) such arguments (I say) as never haue been yet sufficiently answered. Touchinge the word *forreyne*, though indeed the thinges desired by us are in all Churches of other Countreyes fully reformed in doctrine with ours, yet those Churches being all the same houshold of faith that we are, they are not aptly called *forreyne*. As Englishmen travelyng in other Countreyes and livyng after English fashion, are not therefore *Forreyners* in respect of England whiles they so travell; but still to be accounted of the same country, so all Churches and all members of the Church, in what Country so ever they be, are not to be accounted *Forreyners* one to another, because they are all Citizens of heaven, and we make all one family or body.

Besides, the thinges in controversie which we desire to be removed, may much more justly be called both *Noveltie* & *Forreyne*, because they were not of Apostolicall institution, neyther heard of in the Apostles time, yea, condemned by generall arguments in the writings of the Apostles, as hath been shewed in divers other bookes written one our side, not yet answered: especially in the *Abridgment* made by the Ministers of *Lincolne Diocesse*, the Demaunds, and in the 12 Arguments: as also because they are in use in more *Forreyne* Popish Synagogues, then there are reformed Churches in all Europe. Lastly, although Communion with the Churches of Christ in what country soever, be much more to be respected, then fellowship with the sinagogues of Antichrist, yet we do not therefore desire that which we doe, because it is in other Churches, but because the word requyreth the same.



G. Powel

*Answer.*

They refuse to conformance them selues.

None of vs haue ever had the booke of Common prayer authorized by Act of Parliament i Eliz. And some of vs haue never had the book now vrged by the Bishops provided for us, or tendred unto us: How then haue wee refused to conformance our selues? Yet we are deprived. By what right and equity I know not.

The auncient approved Discipline & Ceremonies of our Church.

Not auncient, because they haue not warrant from God. Neither ever so approved, but that from the first Preachyng of the Gospell in this kingdome, they haue been by diuers godly and learned men oppugned.

His Highnes sought to reclaime them by some correction of their obstinacy, as by silencyng etc.

That which his Majestie permitted on that behalfe, was qualified with gracious provisors; 1. To proceede no otherwise therein then accordyng to the lawes of God and the land. 2 To execute even that with all mildnes & moderation. And thirdly, to endeavore to perswade by all arguments, rather thē by censures: which things because they haue not been done, but that in many respectes the Bishops and other Prelats haue exceeded their commission, we doubt not but that if it might please some attending upon his Highnes and in grace with him, in all humble manner to informe him, we doubt not (I say) but that his Majestie, accordyng to his most christian disposition, would graciously respect the humble desires of his subjects therein. Touchyng the other parte of *M. Powels* speech, it is no small abuse of his Majestie to impute unto him the severitie of the Bishops against us: whereas in truth whatsoever his Majestie doth therē, is only through their importunity, and by their accusing us of schisme, disorder, sedition etc.

The



The moderat severity of the Bishops, is unfitly and unduetifully *Gab. Powel* termed oppression, and cruelty.

Is it moderate severitie to turne so many Ministers as *Ans.* are now silenced, out of their livings? Yea, to provide also, that they shall haue no other way or meanes whereby to liue, that so they, their wiues and children may goe a-begging, to the disgrace of the gospel, the dishonor of the land, the greife of the godly, and the joye of the wicked? Especially, is it moderate severity so to doe for such causes? Did they ever read in any antiquity, so many of such quality, & whose labours God had so blessed, to be thrust and cast out as unsavory salt in the time of the gospel, in a kingdome whereof both King and people doe professe the gospel, and in an age, in respect of the sinnes thereof, requyering ten tymes as many preachers more then their are, if they could be gotten? If these be the mercyes of the Bishops, what would be their cruelties? If this be their moderat severity, what would be their extremity if they might be suffered?

If a Father should cast his sonne out of house & home, & utterly disinherit him, because he would eat no cheese, were this moderat severity? What then may be sayd of them that cast out other from the inheritace of the Lord, whose labours God hath blessed to the joye of many an elect soule, & that only for not doying that, against which they can yeeld a farre better reason from God his will revealed in his word, then any man can doe for his not eating of cheese or for any other the like action, from the secret instinct of nature?

The author of these arguments, is not a frayd, to perswade & provoke your Honorab'e Court (these are his owne words) to intercede with his Majestie, that he would compell the Reverend Prelats to surcease their rigorous and cruell dealing. *G. Powel*



The Apostle biddeth *vsto provoke one another to love & to good works.* Heb. 10. 24. Therefore why might not the author of these arguments use this word unto the Parliament for so good a worke, as in all the said arguments is intended. But for the latter words of *M. Powell, to compell the Reverend Prelats* to surcease their rigorous and cruell dealing etc. Where doth the author use them? The drift of all the arguments insinuateth so much. If it be but insinuation, then all the words before set downe, are not the expresse owne words of the author, as *M. Powell* hath said. 2 It may be taken for granted, that the sayd Prelats are so resolute for mainteyning of their Hierarchie, Discipline, Ceremonies, and other conformity, that they will not yeeld one inche, yea not to his Majestie, except they be compelled.

*Cab. Powell*

The Prelats haue soberly and temperatly caryed themselves in their proceedings.

*Answ.*

We will all with one accord most thankfully acknowledge this, when we shall find it. In the meane tyme, we do acknowledge it comparatiuely true, in respect of their wils and desires. For by this answer written by their authority and by divers other tokens, it is apparant that they would gladly provoke us to giue them further advantage against vs, and also that for these causes they would doe more then they doe (yet I speake not of all, I doe unfainedly confess that their is great difference of affections amongst them it respect of us) they would I say doe more then they doe If they feared not the people? No, but if his Majestie, his most Honorable counsell would giue them leaue: and if they feared not as much indignation from his Highnes as now they seeme to be in grace with him; and as much opposition by the honorable Counsell, as now perhaps they seeme



seeme to haue furtherance by some of them that do not so well understand the cause.

Their obstinat superstition hath worthely made them subject to G. Powel the proceedings of the Bishops.

What? Superstition? And obstinate superstition? We were never before ( to my remembrance ) charged with superstition , much lesse with obstinat superstition : but haue alwayes been accounted great aduersaryes to superstitiō. Yea, we hate it with a perfect hatred, yea our soules abhorre and detest the least superstition , much more obstinat superstition, as much as the best of them doe hate it: yea, much more then some of them: it is one of our reasons against some poynts of conformitie, that we judge them superstitious . How then may we be charged with superstition ? Yea with obstinat superstition? But what if we were superstitious? May we therefore be punished contrary to law, or aboue that that the law requyreth? Were not this to ad transgression to transgression, and to punish sinne with sinne? We may not doe evill, that good may come thereof.

The author cryeth out, as if the gospell by such proceedings were banished, Gods worship prophanely adulterated, to the eternall perill of many thousand soules. G. Powel

Where is this outcry ? It is very low and soft, in some secret corner, or written in very small letters, that no man can see or heare of it. The author might well cry out, that the *gospell is in part banished*, by the suppression of so many able, godly, faithfull & paynefull ministers; that Gods worship is in part corrupted, both in the doctrine, especially sithens this late vehement strivyng by our Prelats for conformitie (as shalbe afterwards touched) and also in the other publike exercises of religion by mixture of humane inventions, Ceremonies and Traditions. Yea,



and that heerby we are in danger to haue the candlestickke removed, and the kingdome of Heaven taken from us, and given to a Nation more worthy then we, except by repentance & doing our first works Revel. 2. 5. Yea, making our last works more then our first vers. 19. We doe in time prevent this judgment.

The Parliament is able to convince him heerin of malepart Sycon-  
G. Powel phancy, and manifest untruth.

*Answer.*

I would such accusers ( notwithstanding their such threats of the Parliaments kindnes) would stand with vs, & that we might be admitted to stand with them at the barre of the Parliament for triall of this accusation, and whether the author of those Arguments, or this answerer haue abused that most worthy Senat.

G. Powel This author feareth no rebuke of shame, for his vnconscionable  
dealyng.

*Answer.*

Let this unconscionable dealing be shewed in the author: or else let this answerer be ashamed.

G. Powel

*Answer.*

This man speaketh frō Cimmerian darknes, by concealing his nāe. Then also by the same reason many books of the scripture, the writers whereof haue concealed their names, were written from Cimmerian darknes. The like may be sayd of many other most worthy Theologicall bookes, without name of any writer. Much more may the same be sayd of the booke intituled SCOTTISH GENEVATING & ENGLISH SCOTIZING, and many other such disgracefull and scornfull books published without name of any author, against the desired reformation, and all the favorers thereof. It is also the severitie of the Prelats that maketh vs the rather to conceale our names. If we had as much liberty to publish our books for our selues, as every rayler hath to put forth any thing against us: Yea, as there is for Printing of many profane, filthy, scurrilous, lascivious, &

un-



ungodly bookes authorised by some of them, you should quickly see our names.

The author is bold to offer his writing even to your Honors, *Gab. Powel* to provoke you to supplicat to his excellent Majestie, in behalfe of their cause, or else to determine it of your selues.

*Answer.*

The author never desired this determination you speake of by the Parliament, as though that would or might be authentically without his Majesties Royall assent, but onely that his Majesty thereby seeing the equity of the cause, and the affection of his people therunto, might also be the more easily perswaded to vouchsafe his princely favour towards them therein.

I was commaunded by some in authority to peruse and breifely to refute these Arguments, which at the first I was unwilling to take upon me. *G. Powel*

*Answer.*

If you be so ready to be commaunded to write against such a cause, take heed you be not found a *servant of men*. But if any in authority haue commaunded you this worke, did they also commaund you to rayle and revile your *antagonist* (as you call him) in such manner as you doe? It is lamentable that any in authority in such a Christian Church, should either commaund any such thing, or allowe of it being done. But it is more lamentable to obey. The time was when you did well employ your selfe against the Common adversaries. You did then runne well. What letted you that you did not hold on in that course? What hath provoked you to turn your pen from them, and to whet it now the second time against those, whom you call and should in truth acknowledg your brethren? Doe you feare any violence from the Papists by holding on against them, because perhaps of some former experience? Indeepe, you may well feare such violence from them, and be secure touchyng all danger from us,



318

because you haue learned from the *Apothegme* (after mentioned) of *D. Elmer* late *Bishop of London*, and much more from all experience, that you may justly feare your life and cutting of your throat in the company of one Papist, but that no such thing is ever to be feared amongst ten thousand of (those whom it pleased him to call) prescians.

G. Powel  
*Answer.*

In divers respects I feared to plead in so high a Court, before such judges etc. Yet the equity and holines of the cause moved me etc.

Why should you feare, being commaunded? Would not your commaunders beare you out? It may be they will before men, but who shall plead for you before God, except you repent? Take heed you commend not that to be equall and holy, which agreeth not with the wayes of God.

G. Powel  
*Answer.*

I presently resolved to stand in the gap and breach, between our brethren and vs.

This resolution upon bare commaundement of a man, (it may be also contrary to the likyng of some to whom you are more bound) was too present to be found. How haue you stood in the gap & breach? By treading it down to make it lower than wild beasts, or at the least strang cattell may the more easily break in to devour the Lords vine, and to eat up the Lords people as it were bread.

G. Powel  
*Answer.*

Albeit I knew my brethrens affections to be somewhat unkind, and their pens foule and shamefull.

Whereby knew you their unkindnes and foulnes towards you? Indeed they haue seene and dayly doe see your unkindnes towards them: yea towards the Lord, in oppossing your selfe to the Lords cause, and to them in seeking therof, and that in this bitter manner: yea for the foulnes of your pen you might justly feare the like measure from them againe to you. But God forbid that for that we should sinne against God, and cease praying for you.

See-



Seeing it lyeth not in our powers to make them modest & peaceable, and that we are called to serue God and his Church, which we are bound to doe in good and euill report.

G. Powel

319

Answer.

You should first haue proved us immodest and unpeaceable, before you had used these wordes. God giue those graces to you and us. The seruing of God and of his Church, is not in rayling & reprochfull speeches, in sharpnes and bitternes, in untrue and unjust collections directly contrary to the words of our brethren. But what meane you *by good and euill report*? If as patients, it is well: if as agents it is not so. But though by your booke I haue little cause, yet I will take you in the better sence.

I pray our heavenly Father to forgiue them any injury etc.

G. Powel

Before prayers you should lay aside all wrath of heart, and bitternes of word. *Math. 5. 22. 1 Tim. 2. 8.* Pray also for the forgivnes of the wrongs you doe to vs, both in this booke, and also in your latine treatise *De adiaphoris*.

Answer.

I haue not with drawne my selfe from this worke, no not for the estimation & reverence I haue of the graue judgments of your honors.

Gab. Powel

If you had duely revered their Honors, you would haue feared the offering vnto them such a present of raylings, vnjust collections etc. As if they had been voyd of judgement, not able to discern of such accusations.

Answer.

I mayntaine here the glory of God, and honor of our Prelats.

G. Powel

As our Saviour said, *They shall excommunicate you, yea, the time shall come, that whosoever killeth you, shall thinke that he doth God service.* Ioh. 16. 2. So this answerer thinketh, that he glorifieth God by rayling on his cause & seruants. As for the Honor of our Prelats, you should first haue been on a sure ground for the lawfulness thereof, before you had taken upon you (like a champion) the defence thereof. 2. Even a good cause is rather overthrowne then vpheld by such meanes of scoffing and rayling, as in this

Answer.



this booke you haue vied. Thus much for the answer to the Preface of *M. Powels*.

*THE NEXT THING TO BE CONSIDERED*  
*is his marginall Notes vpon the preface of the author.*

The first note with (a) I passe by.

*G. Powel* b This pretense unto the Christian reader, is because they would not seeme to be petitioners unto the Parliament.

*Answer.*

*M. Powell*  
 maketh the  
 Parliament  
 no christian  
 assembly.

What a strange collection is this? Haue we expressely directed all the said argumēts vnto the Parliament house, and yet would we not seeme to be petitioners unto the? Nay rather sith this answerer thus carpeth at these words *the Christian reader*, gathering from the humble petition of the Author of those Argumentes *to the Christian Reader etc.* that he would not seeme to be Petitioner to the Parliament, may not this be better gathered that the answerer distinguisheth the christian readers from the Parliament, and the Parliament from them, and so maketh the Parliament no christian assembly? But why did the author use those wordes, the christian reader? The reason seemeth double: 1 because he did so account of every one in the Parliament house: 2 because he thought that those arguments might come to the handes of other Christian readers, then onely of Parliament men.

*G. Powel*  
*Answer.*

c The supplicants make the profession of the gospel and all religion to consist in refusing cap, surplice, crosse etc. Great cry, litle wooll.

This etc. After the word crosse, is well added. For otherwise although we hold those things to be matters of religion, yet never any of us did affirme all religion to consist in the. without this etc. therefore, this is an unchristian flander, and to speake according to the answerers learning in *Aristotles Eleuchs*, a fallacy *ab eo quod est secundum quid, ad id quod est simpliciter*. The adage in the end of this  
 note



note is too homely for that Honorable Court to whom the answerer speaketh, as being taken from swyne, which for some causes (not fit to be written) being sometimes shorne, make a great cry, & yeld litle wooll. And though the answerer by this *adage* seeme to esteeme us no better then swyne, (as also in his other booke *De adiaphoris* it pleaseth him to compare us to *Apes*) yet indeed may he well say that the most of us haue but litle wooll on our backes, we haue been so long and often shorne & shaven, that we haue nothing left but our very skine: Yet it may be that some of our aduersaryes hope for wooll and fat from our livings.

d As if his Majestie would be displeased if any promoted a religious or honest cause. A malepart and presumptuous (if not a disloyall) censure.

G. Powel

Is this man in his right minde, that he maketh such collections? The author perswadeth all men from all such un-christian and disloyall suspicions of his Majestie, how then may this note be applyed unto him. In the last Argument (or rather conclusion of all the arguments) where the author speaketh of some that are alwayes accusing and disgracing the ministers (pleaded for with Nobles and Princes,) the answerer maketh this marginall note, *An uniuersall calumny*. Whether it be so or no let all men iudge, as by his whole answer, so particularly by this note, and them that follow, yea by his whole answer to all the preface before the arguments. But to returne, sith sometyms some feare that even of Christian Princes which they nether need nor ought to feare, what malepartnes, presumption, or disloyaltie was there in the author to prevent such feare. Doth not the Apostle oftentimes Rom. 7. 7. and 9. 14. and Galt. 3. 21. and often else

Ansiv.

contradiction in the answer.



where, prevent objections that might, but needed not be made? Shall he therefore be charged with malepert presumption against God and his trueth?

G. Powel

*e* I knowe not wherto all his whole Paragraph tendeth, if the Suppliants deeme not his Maieſty to haue forſaken his firſt loue, and to haue revolted from religion, at leaſt in ſhew for a time. (f) A malicious, uncharitable and unchriſtian allegation to be applyed unto the whole State (that loyally obey his Maieſtie) eſpecially to his Nobles and ſervants.

*Answer*

O uncharitable collections. Let the reader by them judge whither this man doe not accuſe vs, and provoke (what he can) our gracious Prince, his Nobles and all other againſt us: Yea, directly contrary to the words of the author, who laboreth by the whole Paragraph ſpoken of by the anſwerer, to perſwade all men to conceaue well & Honorably of his Maieſtie, according to many former moſt worthy testimonies of his Princely piety and religion. And albe it all in the ſayd Paragraph be ſpoken onely to that purpoſe, yet the anſwerer wreſteth the ſame as intended alſo againſt the whole State, eſpecially againſt his Maieſtie, Nobles and ſervants. But *he that iudgeth righteouſly, to whom we commend the cauſe and our ſelues*, ſhall one day make our righteouſnes knowne.

G. Powel

*Answer*

*g* If they had perticularly applyed theſe things, their mallice had been the more manifeſt.

It greeveth this anſwerer moſt, that we are not ſo malicious as himſelfe, and that we giue no juſt occaſion of further quarrell with us. When they want matter of juſt accuſation, then they pretend that *aliquid latet quod non patet*, ſome thing is hid that is not manifeſt. But of this afterward.

G. Powel

*Answer.*

*h* No bolder & ſecurer cenſurers of all ſorts & degrees of men, under the cope of heaven, then theſe ſingular & ſelfe conceited refractaries.

Yes, this notary is a more bold and ſecure cenſurer, in



as much as in his notes before he hath censured the author of the arguments, and all other desiring that which he desireth, (of what sorte and degree soever) for that that is not expresse, neither intended, nor any wayes to be justly gathered from his words. When this censuring he speaketh of, is proved by any of us, let the partie against whom it is proved beare the blame thereof. If any man censure a tree according to the fruites it beareth, he doth no more then he may.

i How prodigall they are of the Kings thanks.

G. Powel

This note sheweth the prodigalitie of this answerers mallice and words.

The k. is answered before.

l Is a triobular pamphlet such an huge quantity or volume? It G. Powel may seeme the pen man of this supplication was the worthy author of the late two leaved libels.

Secing words (as this answerer saith in his conclusion) *ought to be numbred to so great States*, why should respect of brevity be thus scornfully objected to the author? Especially considering the other manifold & waighty affayres of that Honorable assembly, unto whom the sayd Arguments were directed. If the Arguments were a triobular pamphlet, what would the answer haue been without them: especially without all his cavils, reproches, vnjust collections, vayne repetitions, and that false ground that alwayes he buildeth upon, viz. his supposition that we are schismaticks? The answerer his former booke also *De adiaphoris*, what were it with a lesse margine, without the great multiplicity of sections, and if every bird had her owne feather. The two leaved libells wherof he speaketh, are perhaps the more offensive vnto him, because some of them doe attribute more authority to his Majestie, then they would haue us to doe, or then the prelates doe, that



the challenge so much to themselves.

G. Powel  
Answer.

1 Such presumptuous and selfe conceyted *Elihu*s, are these male content Ministers, who take upon them to instruct such, as be wiser then themselves. *Vide Gregorium in hunc locum.*

What a thing is this? For want of matter against the author, this answerer falleth out with the worthy *Elihu*, as a presumptuous and selfe conceited man, whose wisdom notwithstanding, modestie, and singular humilitie are evident in holy scripture, by his silence till other (more auncient then himselfe) had spoken all they could, as also by his pleading the cause of God himselfe, when all the rest there present had geiven over the same, (in which respect also all in these dayes that plead for God against the oppositions of those that would be accounted the onely wise and learned men, are likewise reproched as presumptuous and selfe conceited) and lastly by the elegancy & eloquence of his speeches, and by the profound and divine matter therein conteyned. Finally are humble petitioners, that bow themselves to the ground, before them to whom they doe petition, are such petitioners (I say) before heaven and earth to be proclaimed presumptuous and selfe conceited instructors? Is this the man that erst now blamed other as bold and secure censurers?

*A REPLY TO THE FURTHER ANSWER OF  
the preface to the Arguments.*

G. Powel

Some haue foolishly made a breach and division amongst us about crosse and surplice etc.

Answer

Wisdom consisteth in understanding what the will of the Lord is, Ephe. 5. 17. And in a conscience of keeping Gods commandments and observing his word. Deut. 4. 6. The which to reject is the greatest folly *Ierem. 8. 9.* We haue made no breach or division at all: But as *Ioseph* for telling his divine dreames, was hated of his brethren, and at  
the



the last sold a way to strangers by themselves: and as the blinde man *Iohn 9.* for confessing Christ, and stoutly standing in that confession, was throwne out of the Iewish Synagogue by the Pharises, so (to use the words of this answerer) we are violently and unjustly broken of and divided, and thrust out of the ministry by other, and yet charged that we haue made a folish breach and division.

Yet we doe all as hartily and faithfully loue and affect our Prince and King (yea of whatsoever religion) and are as ready and willing to defend his person & honor, against all aduersaries etc. And therefore I cannot allow the opinion of such as giue out, that these our factious brethren are as dangerous enimyes vnto the state as the papists etc.

*G. Powel*

*Answer.*

Neither you nor any other, haue ever yet had, or ever (I hope) shall haue cause justly to speake, write, or thinke otherwise concernyng either our loue & loyalty towards our Soueraigne, or our duety to any of his governors: yea though we should cunningly be solicited to some vndutifull practises, as some not many yeares since were, in the dayes of late *Q. Elizab.* of most Honorable memory, who were so farr from enterteyning any such motions, as that most dutifully, they discovered the same to other in higher authority. Though (I say) we should be cunningly solicited to any undutifull practises or to the approbation of any such practise, yet I trust that never any of vs shall be found so to offend against his Majesties meanest and lowest officers.

*D. Elmer* late B. of London gravely sayd, If I were in the company but of one Papist, I might justly feare the losse of my life, but being amongst ten thousand Precisians, well might I be a frayd of my Bishopricke, but never of my throate: the one would cut my coate, and the other my throate.

*G. Powel*

The *Precisians* (as it pleaseth *B. Elmer* to call them) never desired the Bishopprickes of any of their aduersaries, but onely that they would giue glory to him that sitteth up-

*Answer*



326

on the Throne, and cast their miters at the feete of the Lambe, acknowledging him worthy of all rule and Dominion, & contenting themselves with the places and Honors commended in the scriptures: according to an other apothegmaticall exhortation of the sayd Bishop, both made openly at Paules crosse, and also printed (before himselfe was so advanced in the world) viz. *that Bishops and other Prelats should come downe from their thousands, and content themselves with an hundred, untill which abasing of themselves, and resigning that which uniuersally they hold, reigning as Lords & Kings over the Lords inheritance, neither the Church of God in generall, neither our Soueraigne in speciall, shall haue so much service, and good by their service, neither themselves so much peace and comforte of conscience, as otherwise would be.*

G. Powel

Though they be free from suspicion of treason and rebellion, yet it cannot be denyed, but that presumptuously and wilfully, they contend with the Magistrat, impugning his authority in things indifferēt.

Answer.

Cannot that be denyed, which never was, neither ever can be proved against us? 1 We deny that it is the Magistrats meere pleasure that we should conforme, otherwise then by mis information of our adversaryes against us, as David upon the like mis information of Ziba against Mephibosheth, gaue all to Ziba that had been Mephibosheths 2 Sam. 16.2. Yea, they doe not only giue all the mis informations themselves against us which they can imagine, or wherewith they are informed by other, but also they labour what they can to keep the Magistrats from all right information in our behalfe by any other: yea they indeavour their vtmost to keep both Parliament and all other, from mediation for us. 2 Though we yeeld not in all thinges required of us, yet it is not presumptuously and wilfully, but in all humility & modesty: we contend not  
by



by the sword nor any violence, but onely by word, yea, pleading the word of God for our cause. Our contentiō also is in a patient suffering, with a duetifull cleering of our innocency against the false imputations wherewith we are burdened. The things in question haue been said, but never substantially proved to be indifferent in such sorte, and to such vses as now they are urged. Our adversaries haue so long strivē to maintayne the things (which they call indifferent) for such uses as to which they are not indifferent, that they haue made religion it selfe an indifferent thing to many men. In things truely indifferent, it is already justified, and shalbe further justified (if neede requyer) that we attribute no lesse to the magistrat, then our adversaryes doe. Let them name in what sence and degree the Papists deny the Sovereignty of Princes in any thinge, and I doubt not, but that it may be proved that themselues (holding their owne principles) doe deny the same, in the same sence and degree.

Allof them make a faction and schisme in the Church for carnall respects: some because they know not otherwise how to be mainteyned: some to gratifie their benefactors and Patrons and to please their friends: some for discontentment and want of preferment: some for giddines of innovation etc.

G. Powel

What? all *M. Powell*? How doe you forget your selfe? You should haue left this generall judgment of all, to the generall judge of all. There is none of these of whom you speake, but for the world and outward things they might liue better conformyng then not cōforming themselues. What benefit haue any by gratifyng their Patrons? Will their Patrons giue them better mayntenance otherwise? Nay some Patrons are their adversaryes, and are gratified by them that put such Ministers out, that so they may present againe etc. Some so displease their friends heerby

*Answer.*



that by their displeasure they loose more in one day then they get all their life by any Ecclesiasticall living. Some also by displeasing their friends doe not only lose temporall benefits for them and theirs, but doe also hinder them selues of as great Ecclesiasticall promotion, as many or the most of the conformable sort doe ateyne unto. Some by their troubles for this cause, having had good patrimonyes: haue consumed & wasted them so, that in their age (when they need most comfort) they liue in penury and want, and at their death leaue not so much to their wiues & many children, as was left to themselues a lone. Some by want for this cause, are forced to take their children of very great hope and forwardnes for learning frō the schoole, and to make them apprentices to their owne great greife, and in time to the detriment of the Church. Agayne, this imputation of carnall respects unto us (such as you reckon) is contrary to your often imputation of superstition unto vs. For what is superstition, but to make that sinne that is not sinne; and so to feare sinnyng against God, as that we doe not that which lawfully we may do: or one the contrary to make that good, holy, and necessary, that is nether good, holy, nor necessary, and so to think himselfe bound to doe that, which well he might leaue undone? If then we be superstitious, and doe that which we doe in fearing to sinne against God, how can such carnall respects as before are particularized, be imputed vnto us? But the truth is, that these carnall respects doe belong rather to conformiry, for which many will doe any thing rather then they will loose their livyngs. Of how many also of them may it be sayd *that they seeke their owne, and not that which is Iesus Christs?* Philip. 2. 21. *Yea, that their belly is their God, their glory their shame, and that they mind earthly*



*ly things?* Philip. 3. 19. that also with *Diotrephes*, that ~~love to~~ <sup>love to</sup> *haue the preheminence?* 3. Ioh. 9. How many of that side haue receaved 500. or 600. pounds from their people, since their last Sermon, yea, since their last presence amongst them? Yea, are their not some that buy & sell benefices, as men buye and sell horses? Truly there are s<sup>o</sup>me that being not old m<sup>e</sup>n haue in their dayes passed through many benefices, and those of very good worth. To wh<sup>o</sup> then doth this imputation of carnall respectes belong. Cease therefore, cease *M. Powell* to charge us with that against which there are so many reasons. Yea, wherein all the world can convince you.

They haue altered the state of the question. For the question being about subscription, Ceremonies, Conformitie etc. (which are but *G. Powel* things indifferent and of small moment) they make it the cause of God, the ministry of the gospel, the salvation of the people, the mayne cause of the land.

How doe we alter the state of the question? Doe we mince that which somtyme we held? Doe we goe from *Answer* any thing which before we maynteyned? What ever was in controversie betwixt you and us, that is not comprehended under subscription, or some other of the particulars by you here mencioned? It is meere folly so often to reapeate the indifferency of these thinges, that hath never been neither can be proved by you. For as much also as for not subscribyng, and for not conforming to Ceremonies etc. Many more are thrust out of the ministry then for any other matter of ten tymes greater moment, may it not be truly called the cause of God? Especially it being in so many bookes proved that they are unlawfull & contrary to the word of God? Yea, sith for these thinges the word is restrayned, may we not say that the *salvation of the people dependeth thereupon?* And consequently *that it*



*is the mayne cause of the land?* What is greater then salvation? Your selfe grant that we are Ministers of Christ, in grace and favour with God. It followeth therefore that our cause is the cause of God. *Luc. 10. 16.* Yea, of the land also, because besids salvation many other benefits doe depend upon the ministry of the word, and many evils vp on the restraint thereof. *Prov. 29. 18.* For this cause the Apostle joyneth these two togeather in the Iewes, *that they were contrary (or adversaries) to all men, and forbade them to preach to the Gentles.* 1. Thessalonians 2. ver. 15. 16.

Touching your often objection of our suspension and deprivation for not conformyng our selues, consider this one thing *M. Powell*, and consider it seriously, viz. that whē as *Iohn* and some other *Disciples* tooke upon them to forbid one casting out Devills, (that had before done it in the name of Christ) and that only because he would not joyne with them *and follow them to Christ*: and that afterward whē they made relation unto Christ, of that which they had done, and of the reason why they had done it (as though they had done some great service, as many thinke they doe now great service in forbidding us to preach) consider (I say agayne) that our *Saviour* was so far from approving that which they had done, that he rather reprov'd it saying, *Forbid him not.* *Mar. 9. 38. 39.* Whether was a iuster cause of suspension, not to joyne with such worthy *Disciples* of our *Saviour*, and that in following them, and goeing with them to our *Saviour* himselfe, or not to joyne with the *Bishops*, & to conforme our selues unto them in those things, wherein we are perswaded we should sinne against Christ, and in parte goe away from him? For we follow not Christ, neither walke with him any longer, then we doe obserue his word. Further also

con-



consider whether is a greater, or at the least a better and more necessary worke, to cast out Devills from their possession which they had of the bodies of men, or to cast them out from the spirituall possession they haue of the soules of men, which eiection is wrought by the preaching the gospell Acts 26.18.

They make this such a cause, as if all religion depended on refusing of a crosse and surplice etc.

G. Powel

No, no. All religion and piety doth not depend on these things. Yet religion is the lesse, and doth the more decay, the more that the preaching of the gospell, for these things is restrayned. The increase of sinne and iniquity in those places already where such Ministers are put out, doth too much testifie this thing. Heere againe is his former fallacy, as *eo quod est secundum quid, ad id quod est simpliciter*. We say, that some religion dependeth on refusing of a crosse, surplice etc. Hence he concludeth, that all religion dependeth etc. Further, whether we make all religion to depend on refusing a crosse, surplice etc. or no, it semeth that the Bishops make all religion (or the most) to depend on crosse, surplice, etc. For if a man yeeld to these things, he may passe away with any other matter vncontrolled: but if he stands in these things, then he is unworthy the ministry, whatsoever gifts he haue, how godly soever he be, and what good so ever he haue done, or might doe by his continuance. Is it not so?

Answer.

They boldly, presumptuously, and unduetifully censure his Majestie for coldnes in religion, for losing his first loue, deepe dissembling, seeming to pretend one thing and to intend another as if he had been trayned up in the Iesuits schooles to equivocat: which fault I would some of their faction did so litle practise, as his Majestie abhorres it.

G. Powel

Wher is there any such censure of his Majestie for cold-

Answer.

D

nes



nes in religion, for losing his first love, and for deepe dissimbling? Nay, doth not the author expressly labour the quite contrary, professing that he wrote that which he did to this very end, that *men might not iudge Christian Princes upon outward apperences, yea adding supposed apperences?* Yea, wishyng also *lesse censuring of them, and more praying for them?* Is there not by all authors a difference made betwixt *Simulare* and *disimulare*, that the one may be used in godly policy and christian wisdome, but that the other is alwayes *of the flesh fleshly*? In allegation of examples, every particular is not nicely and strictly to be respected, but that poynt onely is to be considered for which they are produced, and wherto they be applyed. Otherwise, from the application of *Dauids eating of the sheew bread*, vnto the Disciples *plucking the eares of corne to eat.* Math. 12.3. A mā may gather that because *David* used lying as a meanes to obtayne the sheew bread at the Preists handes, therefore also it is lawfull for us by lying to obteyne some thing in our necessity. By the same reason also, because the midwiues of *Egypt* are commended to feare the Lord etc. and to haue spared the male children of the *Israelits*, the same fault of lying may be justified, because they being examined by *Pharoh* of that their doeing, excused themselues by a lye. The like may be saide of *Rahab*, commended for her faith in savyng the *Israelits* spyes, Heb. 11.31. Though she defended her selfe from the inquisitors of the King of *Iericho* by a lye. Ios. 2.4.

If the example of *Constantius* and *Iehu*, may for some things be excepted against, yet it might haue been considered, that the author to expresse his generall meanyng the better, did mention also the example of *Ioseph*, and of our Saviour *Christ Iesus*, against whom there can be no exception.



ception. And now to clere his meanyng the better, let the example of *Salomon* in that wherein he is so highly commended, be also remembred: who to try whither of the two weomen were the mother of the living child, commaunded *the lyving child to be divided in twane, and the one halfe to be given to the one woman, the other halfe to the other woman.* 1 Kings 3. 25. Here is a manifest pretense of that which was not inteded. Let the answerer therfore learne, that there is great difference betwixt pretending onely for triall of the affections of other, and deepe dissembling or *Iesuitecall equivocating*, for the hiding or maynteyning of some impiety and wickednes. I doubt not therefore, but I may justifie the author from all such thinges, as by allegation of the examples of *Constantius & Iehu*, are most uncharitably imputed unto him: yea, that also I may truly affirme his meanyng in them to haue been, onely to shew that he conceaved of his Majesties meanyng, that which he was perswaded to be best. Therefore farr was he from all undutifull conceits against his Majestic.

It is also to be observed, that he doth not absolutly say this or that to be his Majesties meanyng, but onely that it might be like to the meanyng of *Constantius, Iehu, Ioseph*, and our *Saviour*: for ought that any man else did knowe. If it be otherwise, Gods will be done: and I hope that whatsoever some doe imagine of such as are silenced and deprived, that upon sight of his Majesties full resolution for the countenancing and authorizing of the Bishops to hold on their course against us, then many will yeeld etc. yet it shall well appere that we haue not depended upon any other then upon God alone: and that that which we haue done, is not done vpon any vayne hope or expectation, but in conscience of that word which is



334

our onely rule and canon whereby to liue, and whereby to dy. Touching the answerers wish that some of our faction (as he unbrotherly speaketh) *did so little practise equiuocating as his Maiesty abhorres it*, either let him name such (if he know any) and let them beare their iniquity, or else let him spare such wishes, as whereby he implieth a secret accusation.

G. Powel Whereas his Highnes heart is evidently discerned to be fully seasoned with true pity etc.

Answer Though flattery be odious, and the wages therof fearful, yet if his Majestie or any other doe well consider the best fruites of a true heart, our loue and loyalty towards his Majestie should be found as good, as the best Prelates in the land.

G. Powel It sufficeth me to haue detected the licence of their raving pēnes, the restraint of which fury, specially belongeth to your Honorable & judicious Court.

Answer. O M. Powell you doe to much forget modesty. Whither pen raveth most, yours or the authors, or whither he or you, (I will not say yee though you write by authoritie of some other) be in most fury, let that Honorable and judicious Court judge. Yea, if it might please his Majestie to vouchsafe the reading of the wrightings, and in his Princely wisdom to consider the dealing on both sides, we would not feare his Royall judgment concerning our cause or our selues. We feare the judgment of one Lordly Bishop ten times more, then the judgment of ten such religious Princes. For we assure our selues of more equitie from his Majestie, then we doe from all Lordly Bishops in the land.

G. Powel. Which your Honors will the rather performe, considering what unchristian conceits they haue of this Honorable assembly, and of all other his Majesties loving subiectes, who loyally obey him and serue God, according to the religion established: resembling them to Con-

stantin.



*stantius* his Nobles. Who became Idolaters and Atheistes upon his commaundement.

As before we haue seene how untruely the answerer *Answer.* maketh this note vpon the authors conclusion, with the letter e *an vnjust calumni* pag 77. in as much as he hath accused the author before of *bold, presumptuous, and unducti- full censuring of his Maiestie etc.* thereby to provoke his Ma- *Contrariety* jesties heaue indignation against us all, so now contrary to the same note, he accuseth us also before the Nobles, yea, before all the states of the whole kingdom. Doeht this man spare us, as he professeth to doe in his second note upon the 4 argument? Touching the matter here objected, it is partly answered before. The authors intent and purpose was only to perswade all his Majesties christian subjectes to thinke Honorably of his Highnes, and not to judge him by outward supposed apparences. Ther was nothing to insinuate any such unchristian censure of this Honorable assembly and of other loving subjectes as this wrangling answerer would wrest from the authors words. The matters in question concerne onely or specially the ministers of the word. The things also commaunded by his Majestie are nothing like to the thinges commaunded by *Constantius*. How injurious therefore it is, to conclude the same sinne to be of them that obey his Majestie in the thinges now commaunded, that was in those that obeyed *Constantius*, I leaue to the judgment of all reasonable men. The fallacies of this collection, in respect of the difference both of thinges and also of persons commaunded, I leaue to the sentence of them that are as skilfull in *Aristotle* his *Elenchs*, as *M. Powell* seemeth to be. The childish accusation of the author from the 8 Argument ( heere inserted either of mallice, or to encrease his



volume) shall be discovered in the defence of that 8 Argument.

Concernyng the Arguments themselves, may it please the Christian reader first of all to take a generall veiwe of the generall fraudes of the answerer in his answer vnto them.

His first generall fraude is, that he setteth upon these Arguments, as though in them the mayne cause betwixt, the Prelats and vs were handled. Whereas the purpose of the author was not to informe the mindes and iudgméts of the Parliament, but, taking that to be already done by other books written in that behalfe, & the rather because he did already see them to deale in the cause; he labored altogether, to quicken their affections, and to whet and encrease their zeale to be the more earnest in that cause, of the equity and sinceritie whereof, by former bookes touching their iudgments they were abundantlie informed and perswaded. And heerin he had the more reason to provoke their godlie zeale, in respect of the manifold & mightie aduersaries the cause had, and because he knew that the sayd aduersaryes would make strong opposition therevnto and labor what they might to hinder the same.

2 Because the mayne controversie betwixt the Prelats and vs is not handled in these Arguments, therefore he insulteth mightily, and often (almost in every page) he objecteth *petitionem principii* & begging of the question vnto us, as though because the controversie were not handled in the sayd arguments, therefore it were not handled else where. But sith it is handled by other whose books & reasons are not yet answered, neither ever will be substantially, therefore this is but a vayne boasting.

His thyrd generall fraud is, that himselfe committeth the



the same fault in all his answer, that he objecteth to the author of the arguments. For whereas the said author vpon sufficient prooffe made of the cause by other bookes, doeth make this the generall conclusion of all the arguments, that it would please the whole State graciously to releue the ministers oppressed for that cause etc: this answerer maketh this his conclusion, that it would please the State to releue the refractary and schismaticall Ministers. So never proving us, neither any other having ever proved us to be refractary, schismaticall etc. (except every Bishop be a *Pythagoras*, and doe alwayes speake oracles, which ~~they~~ <sup>few</sup> feeldome doe) yet he taketh it for granted that we are such. *Huic arenoso fundamento tota strues et moles sequentis Pralatici responsi innititur.* Vpon this sandie foundation the whole frame and lumpe of all the Prelaticall answer following doth relye.

M. POWEL TO THE TITLE OF THE  
Arguments.

All the Arguments following be common (excepting one or two) and may be urged for popery or any other heresy etc. G. Powel

Are Popish or other herericall *Preists, ministers of Christ*, in grace and favor with Christ etc. Doe the Angels so long after, and reioyce in their Ministry as in ours? Doe they as truely interpret the mysteries of God to eternall life, as Ioseph interpreted *dreames* for this life? May they as truely be commended for the spirituall deliverance of many soules, as Ionathan did worke the bodily deliverance of the Israelits etc. The like may be sayd of the other arguments. How then are they so common as the answerer chargeth them to be? This beginnyng sheweth, what we are to looke for in the rest of the answer. Answer.

The first Argument.

D 4

The



*The first Argument.*

*The Ministers supplicated for, are evident to be the true Ministers of Christ. 1 By the speciall hatred of all wicked men against them: Iohn 15.19. 2 By their godly life. 3 By their gifts and by the blessing of God upon their labours. Rom. 10.15. 1 Cor. 9.2. 2 Cor. 3.2.3. Therefore the State ought to releene the being now oppressed: because that which is done for them or denyed unto them, is done for Christ, or denyed unto Christ. Exod. 16.2. 1 Sam. 8.7. Luc. 10.16. Math. 25.40 Gal. 3.25. Ephe. 5.30.*

*THE MARGINALL NOTES OF M. POWEL  
upon the former Argument.*

*Gab. Powel* a That is but justly omitted that makes nothing to the purpose.  
*Answ.* The word gospell signifying the preaching of the gospell, the furtherance or hinderance therof maketh to purpose in this matter, or else nothing doth.

*G. Powel* b There be other Ministers of the gospell.  
*Answer.* I acknowledge it with all thanks to God: and whatsoever difference of judgment or practise there be, betwixt them and us in the present controversie, yet I loue and reverence them for their giftes and paynes. But what then? Though there were ten times as many more, and every one as sufficient as the best, yet these tymes requyre all. Num. 11.29. 2 Tim. 4.1. 2 Tim. 3.1.  
The note with c I passe by. When they shew our proofes not to proue our intent, we will either strenghten them, or bring better.

*G. Powel* d Palpable ignorance. Many lay men, 1 are hated of the world. 2 lead an unblamable life. 3 haue sufficient gifts, ergo They are Ministers of Christ.

*Answer.* Double Sophistry. 1 Where as the author saith, those Ministers that are so hated of the world etc: are the Ministers of Christ, this answerer saith, they (not those Ministers) that are so qualified etc. 2 He leaveth altogether out the last poynt taken from the successe of their Ministry



stery whose arte it is so to clip words, I neede not to note.

e They haue ill neighbours, that commend themselues. But I could wish they were such indeed. albeit they are generally noted to be great G. Powel teachers and practisers of vsury.

Wee haue such ill neightours that as by their dayly *Reply.* false accusations and slaunders against us, doe urge us to pleade our owne innocency, as *Moses, Samuell, Jeremy, Paule* and *Christ himselfe*, having the like neighbors were vrged to iustifie themselues. Usury cannot be so truely proved to be taught and practised by us, as all men see many conformitans to be usurers, *Symonists, non residents, gamesters, potcompanions etc.* Yea, and to defend also some of these things.

f Why doe you not name them?

G. Powel

It is needles. The namyng also of such Prelats as haue *Reply.* commended those whom they haue deprived, may perhaps purchase them as much illwill and hatred with their greater Prelats, as *Nicodemus* and some other had envy with the *Pharises*, for speaking any good word in behalfe of Christ.

g All this evidence can make but a conjecture, and that scarce probable, seeing many heretikes, papists etc. Haue suffered more then all *Gab. Powel* this comes to, for their heresies and superstition.

Thus may the suffering of all Martyrs be eluded. For *Reply.* heretikes have suffered as much. etc. But marke heere his cunnyng. The author speaketh of suffering wrongs, indignities etc. *M. Powel* speaketh of suffering more, leaving out the substantiue of the comparatiue adiectiue more. If he *Sophistry* doe understand the former substantiue wrongs etc: then heretikes, Papists suffer not more. For they are worthy of whatsoever they suffer. If he vnderstand an other substantiue, then he doth sophisticate, and equivocat.

h As we envy not their giftes, so we commend their paynes: and

E

with



wish they had not put their hands to the plough and looked backe.

Reply.

Such good words are litle worth, where there is such actuall unmercifulnes. *James 2. 16.* We looke not backe, but they that call themselves our Fathers, haue beaten & driven us from the plough, except we would wound our foules by sinnyng against Christ.

Gab. Powel i It seemes they favor the doctrine *de opere operantis*: especially waighing the latter part of this Pharisaicall comparison.

Reply.

You know the contrary. *Paule* may as well be said to hold this doctrine as we: because he spake much more of his labors & of the blessing of God upon them, then we haue done or can doe. *2 Cor. 11. 23* The *Pharisaicall* comparison I leaue to them, that take upon them *Pharisaicall* authority.

G. Powel a They commend themselves to disgrace other. A lying and malicious censure.

Reply.

To plead for sufficient Ministers that haue done good is not to disgrace other, but to haue all Churches the better provided for. Touching the ignorance, prophanes, irreligion, contention etc: of many places where there are conformable Miinisters either ignorant or idle, or scandalous, I would there were not too lamentable experience thereof. Wherefore Sir, put up agayne your lying and malicious censure into your owne sheath.

G. Powel

Reply.

b It is not their calling, but innovation & schisme that is blamed.

This is a jest, like as if a man should fall upon another & beate him that had an ague, and say, he beate not him, but his ague. Of innovation and schisme else where.

(c) and (d) I passe by as nothing worth.

G. Powel

Reply.

e As if the kingdome of heaven consisted in meat, drinke, or other outward things. Grosse impudency, or blind ignorance.

1 The kingdome of heaven consisteth as well in the abuse of outward things, as in other matters. 2 The Prelats most offend in that which is heere objected: in that they put men from preaching the kingdome of heaven, that will not yeld to their outward things. To reproche



vs with grosse impudency or blind ignorance beseemeth not *M. Powell*, especially he supposing those arguments to be written by consent of all of our side: whereof some were preachers before he was borne,

f They spare speech for Christ. Wherefore? Because the godly haue *G. Powel* put on the Lord Iesus. A ridiculous conclusion.

A litle thing will make him laugh, that will laugh at this conclusion. *They that haue put on Christ, are also his members, flesh of his flesh etc:* as likewise is expressed in the argument at large, but sophistically omitted by the answerer: who were best to take heed he clip not the Kings coyne, as he clippeth mens words. If the godly be Christs members, doe not they spare speech for Christ, that spare spech for the godly. Call not therefore such conclusions ridiculous, but make you graver if you can. The last note where, when, by whom, being ridiculous, I dismisse with this merry answer, that the predicament *quando* is before *ubi*, and so is the answer of the Bedles questions in *Cambridge*. *Solent quari questiones, quando, ubi, sub quo?*

*THE FURTHER ANSWER OF M. POWEL  
to the first Argument.*

VVe grant the refractary Ministers to be indeed the ministers of Christ, neither is their calling brought into question: yea we hope *G. Powel* they are sent by God, and in grace and favor with God: yet all their giftes and sanctification being but in parte, they may be over seene in some thinges.

Heere is a manifest contrariety. He that is refractary cannot be such a Minister of Christ. He that is in grace & favor with God, ought not to be disgraced and molested by men. The later parte of the answer we never denyed. But are not the gifts and sanctification of the Prelats also in part? May they not be, yea are they not in some things overseene?



It is true also <sup>properly</sup> in matters ~~that~~ <sup>properly</sup> belonging unto their ministry, not to speake for them etc. is to spare speech for God and Christ Iesus. But such are not the things in question, viz. Crosse surplice, etc: which are laudable ceremoies, commaunded for order and decency.

Reply.

1 As it is the duety of all to speake for common Christians not onely in matters properly belonging to christianity, but also in matters of their outward estate, peace, liberty, liffe, and things belonging to their life etc: so it is the duety of all Christians, not to speake onely for Ministers in matters only properly, and necessarily concerning their ministry, but also in other matters. The liberty also of preaching necessarily (though not properly) concerneth the ministry of the gospel (preachyng being the most principall parte of the sayd ministry) so also to preach without givying offence to the weake, and without disgrace to their ministry. For what hope can there be of comfortable successe where the ministry is joyned with offence or disgrace? These thinges are necessary though not proper: wherein the answerer committeth a great error; in confounding that that is necessary, with that that is proper. For many things may be necessary for every calling, which are not proper. Further for the whole ministry to be performed in all purity and sincerity, (as nigh as is possible) according to Gods word and practise of the Apostles, without inventions of men etc: this (I say) is also necessary (not proper) to the ministry, because by inventions of men, the ministry of the gospel is corrupted & weakened, even as mixture of water with wine so weakeneth the wine, that in time also it doth corrupt and decay. These thinges are supplicated for to the Parliament: If Crosse and surplice be laudable Ceremoines, then when or where, the Sacraments are celebrated without them, there wanteth some laudable ceremonies.

This



343  
112

This is absurd and impious. What would further follow heereof I need not to write, we may here also note his cunning, in that he saith not that these things are for order and decency: *but commaunded for order and decency*. Many men weare long hayre, and commaund their sonnes to doe the like for *order and decencies sake*. In like respect many husbands command their wiues to paynt their faces, thus and thus to attire themselves: Are these things therefore *orderly and decent*?

The Second Argument.

By the ministry of the gospell the Angels of heaven receaue diuine revelation to their further ioye etc. Exod. 25. 20. 1 Pet. 1. 12. Ephes. 3. 10. Ergo To speake for the ministry and ministers of the gospell, is to speake for Angels etc.

The marginall notes.

The first with (a) shalbe answered afterward.

b What a consequence is this? The Angels desire to see into the secrets of our redemption, ergo. The ministry of the gospell is prepared for them. G. Powel

These words *into which things the Angels desire to behold*, Reply. 1 Pet. 1. 12. must of necessity haue relation to the thinges before said to be shewed *by them that had preached the gospell*. For there is no other antecedent to the relatiue, *into which*. Therefore the consequence is not to be so scorned by any that knoweth a consequence. Heere also the answerer abuseth his reader, by wrangling with the conclusion and leaving out the principall confirmation thereof, Ephes. 3. 10. Where it is expressly sayd, that *Paule* had receaved the ministry of the gospell, to the intent that unto Principalityes and powers in the heavenly places now (not before in that manner) might be knowne by the Church (let that be also noted) the manifold wisdom of



344

The other two notes touching schisme and contenti-  
on haue been answered, and shall afterwards be answered  
more fully: yet here I ad, that he doth unjustly heere say,  
*their contention*. For we contend not with them, but they  
with vs. We seeke to take nothing from them: they seeke  
and take all from us. *Abraham* for peace with *Lot* (his yon-  
ger, and nepheu) was cōtent to part from his owne right:  
but these are such holdfasts of their rites and ceremonies,  
that for peace with us, they will not part with an inch,  
though they get nothing by the whole. No marveill: for  
they will not parte with that which is the right onely of  
Christ. Let it be therefore here noted, how unfitly in the  
*title pag*, the answerer hath prefixed the sentence of Abra-  
ham Gen: 13. 18. *Let there be no contention etc.*

*Further answer to the 2 Argument.*

G. Powel

This Argument is ambiguous and favors of a paradox. For how  
will they understand it? That Angels should be ministers of the gos-  
pell? Impossible. Or that they should be converted thereby etc? Ab-  
surd: they never sinned: or that they might learne to knowe the wis-  
dome of God? So they doe by all other creaturs, and actions of God:

Reply.

No paradox at all. Neither had the answerer any cause  
to make the two first questions<sup>1</sup>, if he had considered the  
places alleadged. That which he opposeth to the third a-  
gainst knowledge of the wisdom of God by the gospell  
etc: may as well be opposed to mens knowledge of the  
wisdom of God by his word. For they are also taught  
the wisdom of God by his creatures and works. *psa. 19. 1*  
*Rom. 1. 19 20*. The further meanyng of this argument, in a-  
ny speciall manner differing from other, I leaue to the au-  
thor himselfe: who is able (no doubt) to defend his mea-  
nyng, or ready to yeeld better reason to the contrary. But  
be it, that he had no other meanyng in this poynt then o-  
ther men haue, yet the common doctrin of the scriptures  
tou-



touching Angels in this behalfe, maketh the argument good. For the Angels of themselves, know not who be elect, and who be reprobate. This knowledge before calling is proper to the Lord. *2 Tim. 2. 10.* The election of men is made knowne to the Angels, by their calling and conversion, wherein it is sayd the Angels rejoyce *Luc. 15. 7. & 10.* And so accordingly they glorifie God, in glorifying of whom consisteth their happines. The more therefore the word is preached, and men converted thereby, the more the Angels rejoyce, and glorifie God: the lesse the word is preached, the lesse they rejoyce: yea, they may be sayd in some sort the more to mourne. In this respect therefore, the gospell may be said to be for the Angels. So this great paradox is unfolded. The substance of the second parte of this answer to this 2 Argument hath been answered before. Whereas he chargeth us *to forsake our ministry for a few pety accidentall circumstances*; therein he discovereth the nakednes of the Prelats, in inflicting so materiall and substantiall punishment, for a few pety accidentall circumstances. For justice requyreth a proportion betwixt the offence and the punishment. But we acknowledg no offence. For we may not purchase liberty of doing the greatest good, with committing the least evill. He that saith doe good, first saith, *eschew evill.* *psal. 34. 14.* These thinges being also proved evill in other bookes, they are not to be accounted pety and accidentall circumstances. The least sinne against the great God, is to be accounted a great matter.

In his third answer he proclameeth agayne, but proveth not our error and faction. If we erre or be factious, let us in that respect be punished (so notwithstanding that the people be not punished with us) and let us be holpen



346

as we are Ministers.

G. Powel

It doth not follow, that if the wise and judicious Parliament, should iustly refuse to deale in the cause of Schismaticall Ministers, further then only to admonish them to desist from their singularity, etc: therefore they should provoke God and Angels. Yea, if they should take parte with Schismatikes, and intercede for them, to deteyne them and the people still in faction, then they should provoke God, etc. psa. 50: 17 18

Reply.

Indeede now you speake sure: and if alwayes you speak so, you shall not be trapt. If the Parliament *iustly refuse etc. and if we be schismatiks and singular etc.* then all is well on your side: But when will you proue us such? As I shall anon proue the contrary, so in the meane tyme for singularity, it belongeth not to us, but to the Prelats, that are singular by themselves, differing from the word, and from more Churches reformed then we; both in judgment & also in practise. But to returne to your other words, thus I reason from them against you. *The wise and iudicious Parliament will not intermedle in the quarrell of Schismaticall ministers further then onely to admonish them to desist from their singularity etc.* all these are your owne words.

But the Parliament hath further intermedled for vs etc. ergo. We are not schismaticall. Either therefore recant your commendation of the Parliament, or else revoke your reprochfull accusing vs to be schismatikes. *Vtrum horum mauis accipe.* I suppose you will not charge the Parliament, with any thing contrary to the commendation you haue before geiven of them; and which all wise and judicious men will acknowledge to be due vnto them. Therefore I hope you will *de nobis palinodiam canere*, and never heerafter charge vs as you haue done.

Here is one thing more to be noated as some what crossing my former supposall, for not revoking his former commendation of the Parliament, yea, & making me to feare that



that he will rather impute folly to them (according to the manner of some other Prelats) then revoke his reproches against vs. What is this that is to be noted: viz. That to proue, if they should take parte with vs, then they should provoke God and the whole host of heaven against us, that (I say) to proue this, he applyeth unto them, psal. 50. 17. 18. Whereby he insinuateth, *that they having interceded for us, doe therefore hate to be reformed, haue cast Gods word be hind them, haue runne with theeuers, and taken part with adulterers.* For these are the expresse words of the psalme, which he applyeth to the Parliament for dealing in our behalfe: so indeede accusing us as the principall offenders in those sinnes, that are mencioned in that psalme, but yet making the Parliament also accessary with us in them.

### THE THIRD ARGUMENT.

*It was a fault in Pharaoh his butler, that he did no sooner remember to speake to Pharaoh for the libertie of Ioseph, and for his release from his affliction. Gen. 40. 14. & 23. Seeing Ioseph had interpreted his dreame of reconciliation to the grace of Pharaoh, and to his former place of earthly honorable service in the house of Pharaoh.* Ergo

*The Parliament ought so to remember the interpretation of the mysteries of God his favor and heavenly kingdome by the ministers now silenced: etc. That they doe what lawfully they may, to release them of their troubles.*

#### I Marginall notes.

a This and most of the arguments following are grounded upon a false principle, viz: that the refractory Ministers quarrell against the Church of England, is the ministry of the gospel, the salvation of the people etc: wheras indeed all the contention is about crosse, surplice, and some other indifferent Ceremonies. and actions in the Church. And all these arguments doe specially make against them, seeing they be onely disturbers of the sincere profession of the gospel, and worke

G. Powel



of the ministry : yea seeing they forsake their calling, and moue so great contention.

G. Powel

And agayne.

b would God they were halfe so diligent in a good cause, as they are importunat to sow schisme and sedition among brethren. But they deserue small commendation etc.

Reply.

One reply shall serue to both these notes. Especially because (as it is noted before) all the answer is grounded upon a false principle, *that we are schismatiks etc.* and so worthy of all that hath been done unto us. To insist therefore upon this poynt, I say first of all, that this accusation of vs to be such, is a most beggerly begging of the question, most unjust, untrue, and uncharitable, never yet proyed, neither able to be proved, vntill they proue the matters in controversie, to be meerely indifferent to such uses, as whereto they are imployed & urged by them, yea, good and laudable Ceremonies, matters of decency, and order in the Church : yea, that we also refuse to conformance our selues unto them, more of stomacke, then of conscience. Much lesse can they iustifie their proceedings against <sup>vs</sup> and punishing of us: yea not onely of us, but also of our people (a thing most unrighteous and odious to God & men) in such manner as they haue done, especially more for these things (which themselves call indifferent, small, pettie, accidentall, circumstantiall) then they doe other, for things expreily forbidden by God himselfe, & a thousand tymes more offensive to other, and more reprochful and disgracefull to our Church, profession, and kingdom then these things. Yea it is to be observed, that notwithstanding all these proceedings against us, all our bookes written against the ceremonyes, (onely to shew the righteousness of our cause) and all their writtyngs against us,  
none



none of them haue ever yet, either in open consistory, or in privat conference ( that I haue heard of ) or in publike writing, made any one, (no not one) demonstratiue reason, necessarily concluding the lawfulness, and the good and necessary use, of the things they so heavily impose vpon us. Some indeed haue written against some of our arguments, but no otherwise, then the witt of man may caviil against any principle of religion, though never so substantially proved by the best diuine upon the earth.

But to returne to the poynt, there is nothing in these two notes and in the rest of the booke objected against vs, where with our auncients and betters, haue not been charged in former tymes. *Elia* was charged with troubling *Israell*. 1 *King*. 18. 17. *Michaiah* might haue been charged with singularity and schisme, for dissenting from all the 400 Prophets in *Ahabs* time. 1 *King* 22. *Jeremy* was accused by the *Preists and Prophets* of his tyme, to haue spoken against the state of the City, and to be therefore worthy to dye. *Ierem*. 26. 11. *Amos* was charged by *Amazia* the preist, with such conspiracy against the King, that the land was not able to beare all his words. *Amos* 7. 10. All the *Iewes* was generally accused by *Haman* to *Ahashuerosh*, not to haue obserued the Kings lawes. *Ester* 3. 8. *Ezra* and the *Iewes* with him, were accused by *Rechum*, *Shimshay*, and other beyond the river to *Artashasht* the King, as rebellious and wicked for building of *Ierusalem*: Yea, they were not only so accused for the time present, but also for the time to come, (as we are afterward in the 16 Argument in the marginall note with (r) that if they were suffered to proceed in building of the City, they would not pay toll, nor tribute: nor custome, yea, *Ezra* and his companions were not onely charged to be such, but the whole City of *Ierusalem* for former

Our betters  
heretofore  
charged as  
we are now.



tymes was also charged to haue been a rebellious & noysome City vnto Kings and Provinces, that the inhabitants thereof had moved sedition of old time, & that for that cause, that Citie had been destroyed. Therefore also the sayd Rehum and Shimshay and their companions, pretended regard of the Kings Honor, in writing so against Ezra and the rest of the Iewes, Ezra 4.12. etc. The enemyes of Daniell framed the like accusation of him to Darius, Daniell 6. Our Saviour himselfe was blasphemed by the name of a seducer & deceiver of the people. Ioh. 7.12. Yea oft tymes as a blasphemer, profaner of the Saboth, a friend to publicans and sinners. Paule was accused to haue taught men against the law and the Temple. Acts 21.28. and to be a pestilent fellow, a mover of sedicion. Acts 24.5. yea to be an heretike verse 14.

Such also haue been the accusations of all Martyrs by the common aduersaries: the Papistes. It is therefore the more to be marveilled at, that our Prelats (professing, and sometime preaching the gospell) doe accuse vs in like manner. Yea, charge us to disturb the sincere profession of the gospell, and worke of the ministry, and yet alleadge no reason heerof: or at least no other reason then such as for which all or the most part of those before named, were so charged as we haue heard. For besides traditions of men, antiquity (not proved, at least not true antiquity) the commandements of Princes (procured by themselves, uncharitably misinformyng such princes) besides thes things (I say) what else haue they said, doe they say, or can they say?

The Ministers not yelding to conformitye, are no schismatics.

Doe we vary from the sincere doctrine of the scriptures? Nay, rather many of them doe much more swarue from the same: especially sithens their late strong patronizing and urging of these things: yea, they haue fallen from that



that that heertofore hath been constantly, and generally held by our Church now teaching these thinges, which haue been accounted and are in truth, popish, or *Lutheran* errors: viz: touching generall grace, & the death of Christ for every particular person: against perticular election & reprobation: for images in Churches, both for remembrance of history and also for devotion: touching the māner of Christs presence in the supper of the Lord: That the Pope is not the Antichrist, which is the next step to say, that he is Christs vicar, & wherby they hinder (what they may) the zeale of Christian Princes from executing that against him in generall, and against his members in perticular, which the word partly foretelleth, and partely commaundeth to be done: concernnyng also the necessity of Baptisme: touching auricular confession: for ignorance (according to the popish saying, *that ignorance is the mother of devotion*) that it is not necessary for the people to haue much knowledge, and that therefore not much preaching, but that it is sufficiēt, if they can say the Lords prayer, the ten cōmaundements, and the articles of faith: which is directly contrary to the scriptures. *Ioh. 6. 69. Ephe 4. 13. Philip. 1. 9. & 3. 7. 8. Colos. 3. 16. Ephes. 5. 17. 2 Pet. 3. 18.* Who can lay any such poyntes to us, or to any of vs? This poynt is not lightly to be regarded: yea, it is of great moment. For the Apostle describeth schismatikes, not to be such, *as make division onely*, but he addeth, *contrary to the doctrine which they had learned.* *Rom. 16. 17.* Yea in the very next verse he describeth them further, saying, *They that are such serue not the Lord Iesus Christ, but their owne bellies, and with faire speeches, and flattering, deceaue the hearts of the simple.* Doe we so? Nay rather we labour onely for the ordinances, which the Apostle hath taught vs. In this respect



spect we *serue not our owne bellies*, but rather for those ordinances sake, and to serue the Lord Iesus by them, and according unto them, we depriue our owne bellies of that which otherwise they might haue; neither *doe we vse faire speeches, and flattering, but by playne dealing* for those ordinances of Christ Iesus, we procure the displeasure of all men against us. As therefore this place maketh for vs, and evidently sheweth vs to be no schismatikes, so likewise it doth as plainly proue them to be schismatikes that *make division* for humane inventions, either in doctrine, or otherwise in practise in the worship of God, contrary to those things which they haue learned from the Apostle; who also therein, *serue not the Lord Iesus, but their owne bellies, vsing faire wordes and flattering* in that behalfe to *deceiue* not onely *the simple*, but also if it be possible, them that are wise.

Agayne haue we made any departure from the Church? We are deprived of our Ministry, and so thrust out of our lyvinges, perforce against our wills, as any man leaveth that which is violently taken a way: but though we be thus put from our ministry and lyvinges by our Prelats, yet we do not forsake the communion of the Church. The cause also why we are put out, is not for respect of our selues, but for feare of sinnyng against God, and of aggravating the burden of our owne conscience therby. *We disturb not the sincere profession of the gospell, and worke of the ministry*, but in all humilitie, and with the wordes of sobriety, we condemne the corruptions of our profession and of the ministry, most duetifully and by all lawfull meanes (and no other) desiring both to be reformed, according to Gods word. So in like manner we desire to be eased of those cloggs, which hinder both us in the worke



worke of the ministry, and also the people so, that they neither doe, neither can so edifie themselves in their most holy faith, as otherwise they and we would doe. On the contrary, the Prelats stoutly mayntaine and support the sayd corruptions, and in loue of them (or rather of some other matter depending upon them) they hate and molest us.

Agayne haue we loytered in the worke of the ministry? Haue we heaped benefice upon benefice? Haue we eatē and drunke, and beaten our fellow servants? Haue we fought our owne, & not that which is Iesus Christs? *Phil. 2.21. Haue we made our bellies our God? Haue we minded earthly things?* philip. 3. 19. I speake not these things boasting (as before we haue been charged) but onely to purge our selues of those crimes, which the former two notes did cast upon us, and to proue that we haue not been disturbers but furtherers of the sincere profession of the gospell, and worke of the Ministry. Therefore let them that do so vntruely accuse us, take heed that he (whose checke no flesh shall be able to indure) doe not charge them, rather *to haue taken away the key of knowledge, and to haue shut up the Kingdome of heauen before men, not goeing in themselves, neither suffering them that would enter, to come in. Mat. 23. 13.* whereas also the word *Schisme* in the Greeke language signifieth a renting, and the word *sedition* in the latine tongue signifieth *seorsum ire*, to goe a side or, a going aside: as we haue proved that in these significations, we cannot be justly charged with them, so let them that doe charge vs in this behalfe see and consider well, whether themselves may not more truely be sayde to haue rent themselves, and to haue gone a side, first from the word (the rule of all Churches) in the poyntes of doctrine before



35A

mentioned, and in some other, as also in the observing & maynteyning of humaine Ceremonies in the worship of God: 2 From other Churches of Christ Iesus: both the auncient Apostolicall Churches, and also the present Churches reformed in other Coūtries: nether of which either held or doe hold such poynts of doctrine as before I haue named: or haue or doe obserue & maintayne such humaine Ceremonies in the worship of God, as are here in question. We beyng charged with heresye & schisme by the Papists for renouncyng the doctrine and communion of the present Romish Synagogue, doe truely returne the same charge upon the papists touching herisie and schisme, because they haue fallen away from the doctrine and auncient simplicitie in the worship of God, that at the beginnyng was in the Auncient Romane Church, and in other true Churches, planted by the Apostles. In like mannner therefore let our accusers in the feare of God consider, whither the blame of schisme doe not for the causes before expressed, more aptly belonge unto them, then to vs etc.

Let me yet also (though somewhat perhaps out of place) ad one reason more, to proue the Ministers pleaded for, not to be Schismatikes.

All Schismatikes are abomination to the Lord: The Ministers pleaded for: are not abomination to the Lord, but in grace and favour with him, *Ergo*: The Ministers pleaded for, are no Schismatikes. The proposition or first parte of the Argument, is *Salomons*, who among the sixe thinges which the Lord hateth, and the seven which the soule of the Lord abhorreth, he reckoneth *him that rayseth up contention among brethren*. The asumptiō or second part of the former Argument is granted by the answerer him-



answerer himsele in his answer to the first Argument: yea it is manifest by the good successe of their ministry from God in the sayd Argument mentioned. Yea, and that this argument from the blessing of God upon their ministry, is of force, and much to be respected, appereth by the words of the blind man reported with commendation by S. Iohn. *This is a meruelous thing that ye know not whence he is, and yet he hath opened myne eyes. Now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doth his will, him heareth he.* And verse 33. *If this mā were not of God, he could haue done nothing.* Was this argumēt good from the opennyng of the eyes of the body of one that was borne bodily blind, and is it not much stronger: from the opennyng of the eyes of the minde of many that are borne spiritually blind?

The further answer of M. Powel to this third Argument conteyneth nothing, but that which is partely answered before, and partly to be answered afterward. Therefore I passe the same by and come to the 4. argument.

The Fourth Argument.

*The Israelits so respected a bodily deliverance wrought by Iona-  
than for them, that they saved him from danger of death. Ergo  
Much more ought this Christian high Court of Parliament, (be-  
ing not a company of rude souldiers, but the cheife flower of this  
Realme, and representing the whole Realme) so to respect the spi-  
rituall deliverance of themselves and of many other, wrought by  
the Ministers now silenced etc. That they speake what lawfully  
they may for all lawfull releefe of them against their troubles.*

The marginall notes.

<sup>a</sup> Ionathans case and the Schismaticall Ministers is altogether un-  
like. And the urging of this zeale, having not the like cause, seemes to  
be dangerous. But I spare my brethren.

G. Powel

G

The



The author urgeth not this argument from *Ionathan* as from a like example, but from a comparifon a *minore ad maius*, from the lesse to the greater. Therefore though there be not the like caufe, yet there being greater, viz. From confideration of a spirituall deliverance there is no danger therein. The author by this example moveth only the Parliament to be zealous for the faide Ministers, Is there danger now in the zeale, of fo wife & judicious an affembly? It is alfo acknowledged by the answerer afterward, that the *Israelits* did juftly refcue *Ionathan*. Is there any danger then by an example of them that did juftly, to provoke the wife Parliament, to pleade with a wife and religious Prince for the Ministers. Wherin then doth this answerer spare vs, that seeketh every corner, to find something for which he might (if he could) hang us?

G. Powel

b The greater is their sinne, whose superstition, and wilfull obstinacy hath restrained their libertie, and made them unserviceable in the Church.

Reply.

Is it not a strange thing ( I had almost saide, sinne) that it should be accounted sinne, superstition, and wilfull obstinacy, yea, such as makes men unserviceable in the Church, (in feare of sinnyng against God) soberly to refrayne from humane Ceremonies, and yet swearing, swaggering, rioting, gamyng, dronkennes, whoredome, adultery, (even in the sight of the world) should not make men unserviceable etc? That such things are, in many suffred and countenaunced in the ministry, is knowne to many of the Parliament house. If his Christian Majestie were also rightly informed thereof, I doubt not but that thinges would be otherwise ordered.

Further answer to the 4 Argument.

The Ministers did but their duty etc.

If



If men should alwayes be so answered, when in their necessities they should require some help and comfort, in regard of some former kindnes; would not men cōdemne such answerers of great ingratitude & in humanitie? viz. Thus to be answered, that which you haue done was but your duety?

*Ionathans* example is unlike unto the suppliant. For *Saule* in hypocrisy had made a rash vowe etc. But the actions of our Sovereigne are not so exorbitant, etc: but advised and just etc. G. Powel

See how wise the children of this world are in their kind? The author altogether wisely and purposely (as it seemeth) concealed the name of *Saule* in the argument; that he might reason from the comparison of the worke onely of *Jonathan* in a bodily deliverance, for the better regard of the Ministers now silenced etc. In respect of the spirituall deliverance of the people by them. This (I say) he doth without any mention at all of *Saule*, that so the worke might be generally and simply respected in it selfe; without any perticular eye unto *Saule*, out of whose hāds the people delivered *Jonathan*. He respected their thankfulness in delivering *Jonathan* from death, without respect of the person that would haue put him to death. Reply.

Agayne, I know not why the answerer should thinke the author to meane rather our gracious King as answerable to *Saule*, then the Prelats, the cheife and principall actors, in all wrongs and injuries done unto the Ministers pleaded for: except that either he had rather impute all hard dealing to his Majestie than to the Prelats: or that hereby he would provoke the more wrath, against the author and all by him supplicated for, whom before not withstanding he seemed greatly to spare. Further if the Israelits justly rescued *Jonathan* as the answerer confesseth *they did iustly*) much more iust is it, that many ministers



should be releev'd in their troubles. If yet they presse the author further for meanyng *Saule*, and comparing our King unto him (as *Saule* was the Lords annoynted) what is the danger, wherein the answerer before should bragge of sparing his breth'ren? Can he gather any undutifulnes towards his Majestie? Or can he imagine, the author to haue intended any forcible meanes to be used by the Parliament, that sitting to make lawes against force and violence towards any subject, must therefore much more themselves be farre from offering any force and violence towards their Sovereigne? Doe the words in the Argument (*to be Zealous and earnest*) import any such matter? Force and violence of any, especially of subjects against their Princes, is rather of Popish fury and madnes, then of any Christian zeale and earnestnes. Besides, the often most Honorable mention of his Majestie in the Arguments, and his expresse presing the Parliament to doe all in humility & modestie, (in the next argument) yea, that they should not onely use boldnes, but christian boldnes, yea, that they should *put forth all their giftes and graces, of knowledge, Zeale, compassion, modesty and humility*: yea, finally, that in the preface he petitioneth, nothing by him written, *to be understood of any other meanes, then good, honest, lawfull, peaceable, and agreable to every mans calling*; All these things doe abundantly cleere the author from all undutifull intent and meanyng against his Majestie. That the Israelits did not in such humility speake for *Jonathan* to *Saule* as they should haue done, in regard that *Saule* was the Lords annoynted; this is not so much to be respected, as the consideration and reason, why they rescued *Jonathan*. Neither is the Argument, by that wherein they fayled any ~~thing~~ weakened, but rather the more strenghtened. For  
if



if they so respected a bodily deliverance wrought by *Iona than*, that they passed the bounds of their duty; should not the regard of a spirituall deliverance, moue such a christi-  
an assembly to speake what lawfully they may, with all  
modesty and humility.

## THE FIFTH ARGUMENT.

*Nehemiah spake to an heathen King for the materiall Ie-  
rusalem. So did Hester to the like King for her people, and that  
not without great danger to her selfe. Ioseph also of Arimathea  
and Nicodemus, (both timorous men) spake boldly to Pilate,  
(an heathen also) for the body of Christ beyng dead, that they  
might honorably bury it: yea this they two did, when all the Dis-  
ciples of Christ had forsaken him, as also when his enemyes had  
prevailed against him. Yet all these had good successe in that for  
which they spake. Ergo Much more ought this High Court of  
Parliament, to speake to a Christian and religious King, for the  
building of the spirituall Ierusalem, for the spirituall state and  
furthering of the soules of many depending upon the Ministers  
now molested, and for whole Christ Iesus now living and raig-  
nyng.*

## Marginall notes.

a Impertinent example.

This note is impertinent, as shall appeare by his answer  
afterward, and the reply therunto.

G. Powel  
Reply.

b A foule beggyng of the question, as if the schisme of a few, were  
so just and important a matter, as the delivery of the whole Church,  
from intended certeyne destruction.

G. Powel  
Reply.

The substance of this note (touching schisme) being  
like the song of the *Aprill bird* that hath but one note, I  
haue often answered. Though we were such Schismatiks  
as the answerer chargeth us to be, yet we ought to haue  
that benefite of law which Paule claimed even in *Nero*  
his time, and was not denyed it. *Acts 25.12.*



G. Powel

c These pure Angels of light thinke all the world in darknes, besides themselves.

Reply.

These scoffes can hardly come from a pure mind, but doe rather beseeeme prophane Angels of darknes, then the children of light: much lesse the Preachers of holines. Whether we that are depriued and silenced, are fitter for the worke of the ministry, then 5000. in the land that stand for ministers, and receaue the wages of Ministers; I will not say, *let the whole High Court of Parliament iudge,* but, let many of the Prelats and other conformitans judg.

G. Powel

d An impudent untruth of a false Prophet. They made themselves incapable of any place in the ministry.

Reply.

Let all those that charge us with impudency, and making our selues incapable of the ministry, take heed that one day, *they be not ashamed before the Sonne of God at his cōmyug: and that then also the Sonne of God be not ashamed of them, before his Father and his holy Angels,* and so pronouce them incapable of the kingdome of heaven; yea, least also *the master of such a servant come in an houre, that he is not ware of, cut him of, and giue him his portion with hypocrites.* Mat. 24. 50. 51. Michael the Archangell durst not blame the Devill with cursed speaking, but sayd, *the Lord rebuke thee.* Iud. 9. You know what is written by an orator, of an orator. *Ex eius ore, verba magno impetu atque aestu erumpebant, non secus ac feruentes aque ebulliunt et exiliunt.* That which is sayd of his words, may be sayd of the reproches, raylings, scoffings etc: of this notary. But are we false Prophets? *False Prophets runne before they are sent. They speake out of their owne hearts, they follow their owne spirit, and haue seene nothing.* Eze 13. 2. 3. Jerem. 14. 14. *They flatter, & heale the hurt of Gods people with sweete wordes, saying, Peace, peace, where there is no peace.* Jerem. 8. 11. They are hypocrits, pretending great holi-



holines, commyng in sheeps apparell, but being inwardly ravenyng wolues. Math. 7.15. *They are covetous and cruell like a roaring Lion, ravenyng the pray, devouring soules; taking riches and precious things etc:* Ezech. 22.25. They are proud and ambitious, *loving the prayse of men, more then the prayse of God.*

Can we be charged with these thinges? Hath not the Lord sent us? Doe we speake any thing but that the Lord hath put into our mouthes? Our flattery consisteth in playne reprehending of sinne, and denouncyng the judgment of God against the same. Our covetousnes is inspendyng all we haue, and leaving nothing to our posteritie. Our cruelty is in suffering the manifold injuryes that are done unto us. Our hypocrisie is in a care of keeping a good conscience. Our ambition is in the abasing of our selues, beneath the parentage and education of many of us: and in bearing the scornes & reproches of the world, yea, in beyng accompted the skumme of the ~~worlde~~ and contemned by some, that haue been glad of the crustes that haue come from some of our tables. Why then doth this Notary call the author of those Arguments, or any other by him pleaded for in his Arguments, by this odious name of *a false Prophet*? If the Lord rebuke him for so calling us, I pray that it may not be in anger. Touching our *in capacitie* of any place in the ministry, wherefore are we so incapable? What be our errours in doctrine? What are our vices in life? Is conformity the cheife and most cardinall virtue? Is it the soule of a minister, *tota in toto, et tota in qualibet parte*? Must all learnyng, all piety, all gravity, all soundnes giue place to conformity? So it seemeth. For learned men, godly men, graue men, and sound Divines (I speake not of my selfe, I confesse my selfe



362  
 selfe the meanest of many hundreds) such men (I say) are thrust out, and ignorant men, wicked men, young men, corrupt and Popish men, are put into the service of the Church. May we not say, *Plead thou our cause O Lord etc?* psal. 35.1. Yea rather may we not say, *Arise O Lord, mainteyne thine owne cause: remember thy dayly reproches by the foolish man.* psal. 74.22.

G. Powel e They meane their Presbyterie.

Reply.

This is but a scoff and mocke. But though we be mocked, yet let this mocker remember, that *God is not mocked.* The author speaketh expressly of the ministry of the gospel which is for instruction, this Notary saith, he meaneth thereby, their Presbytery, which is for goverment. But more of this afterward.

G. Powel f Note this, They would haue all the Bishops removed & deprived.

Reply.

Doe you gather this, because mention is made of removing of the lets and impediments of the *sincere ministry of the gospel?* Then it seemeth that either you would haue a sharpe phisitian for the casting of waters, sith you can see such invisible things in a mans words, or else that your owne conscience told you that the Bishops are great lets and impediments *to the sincere ministry of the gospel.* If you be of that minde and shew the same, it wilbe no small let and impediment to your owne preferment with the Bishops, If you be not, then surely this your note is not worth the noting.

G. Powel g If we professe Christ and maintayne his gospel, what doe they plead for then? VVherefore haue they denyed it all this while, pretending they labour for nothing but the gospel, & the ministry therof?

Reply.

What an untruth is this? Where haue we denyed Christ here to be professed, and his gospel maynteyned? But though we professe Christ & maynteyne his gospel, yet we plead, 1 for the better continuance of the gospel where



where already it is: 2 That so it may the better be where it is not: 3 That it may be more glorified, and the better flourish and fructifie in all places: all which things cannot be, if the proceedings begunne be not stayd and mitigated. 4 May not a kingdome in generall professe Christ and maynteyne his gospell, and yet haue some superfluityes, which obscure Christ and hinder his gospell; as also want some things belonging to Christ and his gospell, which may make Christ more glorious, and further his Gospell?

h Lo: now the Disciplinariay ataxie, for which the suppliants plead so much, is whole Christ Iesus. Intollerable blasphemie. G. Powel. Reply.

So cryed the High Preist, when Christ confessed himselfe to be *the Sonne of the liuyng God*. Math. 27. 65. If it had pleased you notwithstanding, you might in charitie haue otherwise vnderstood the authors words. But let the meanning be as you take it: haue you caught him in any trap? Nothing lesse. For what else can be gathered, but that in the profession of the gospell here in England, there are defects and wants? That the Church of Christ among vs, is in some sort defectiue? And although we haue Christ in his word and Sacraments, and in other exercises of religion, yet we haue not whole Christ, in that we haue not all his ordinances? And that therefore some thing more ought to be added, that Christ may raigne more fully & absolutely over us? Neither is there any such ataxie in the Discipline by these wordes signified. For we desire nothing but *the order, wherein the Apostle reioyced*. Colos. 2. 5. Whereof also we haue the *rudera*, and (as it were) the *stumps* yet remaynyng, in our Parishionall Church-wardens and fidemen: though intituled with other names, and wanting that ordination and authority, which with

H

the



the Pastors within there owne Parishes, Elders ought to haue. This Discipline (if we might haue equall hearing) we could casily free from all such imputations, as wherby it is commonly disgraced by the aduersaryes therof with Princes and Nobles. Yea we could plainely and truely shew the same to be nothing prejudiciall, but very helpfull both to all Royall authority, and also to Nobility: yea better agreeyng with the one and the other, then all other inventions of men for Ecclesiasticall goverment whatsoever. Touching the intollerable blasphemie, imputed in the end of this note to the author of the Argumēts by way of an exclamation, it lyeth upon them, that feare not openly to deny Christ Iesus to be *law giver and King of his Church*. How it can be cast upon us, for desiryng whole *Christ Iesus* (I meane all his ordinances) I can not discern.

*Further answer to the Fifth Argument.*

G. Powel Zeale and courage for defence of Gods truth and Church is commendable: but it were rashnes and foole hardines: for any to adventure hazard and danger, by intermedling in a frivolous quarrell, and in a cause not justifiable.

*Reply.*

M Powels  
censure of  
the Parlia-  
ment house.

Now you pay home indeede. If *Cardinall Wolsey* were livyng, he could speake no more imperiously. For except by a *frivolous quarrell, and a cause not iustifiable*, you meane not the cause of the Ministers; you speake nothing to the purpose. If you meane that (as needes you must) then doe you not speake to vs poore Ministers alone, but also to the Parliame nt, and to all other (Noble men or gentlemen) that haue intermedled, or shall intermedle in our cause. Yea, then you doe not cunnyngly, but openly & playnly, charge all such with rashnes and foolehardines. If you had been a man that in heart had not cared for the opposition of any, yet this speech would scarce haue besecmed  
your



your person. One of us for halfe so much against the meaneſt Prelat, yea against the baſeſt Chancellor, ſhould haue payd full ſweetly. But your ſide ſeeme to haue privilege of ſpeake and writing what you pleaſe againſt any, yea againſt many: yea againſt the High Court of Parliament. Yea, againſt whole Churches and kingdoms For the reſt if we cannot make our cauſe good and juſtifie the ſame, ſo that all your ſide ſhall not be able ſubſtantially to anſwer, without ſcoffing, rayling, wrangling and ſophiſtication, then let our quarrell be accounted frivolous, and our cauſe not juſtifiable.

There are great ods betweene theſe examples propoſed, and the refractarie miniſters caſe. G. Powel

There ſhould be ſuch ods. For the author reaſoneth not *Reply.*  
*à ſimilibus* or *paribus*, from likes or equalls, but from the leſſe to the greater.

In the tyme of *Nehemiah*, the Iewes by long captivity, were in great affliction, the walls of Ieruſalem broken downe etc. But our Church hath long flouriſhed, is glorious ſtill, and more and more increaſeth. G. Powel

I will not ſay your wordes are like to his wordes that *Reply.*  
boasted ſaying, *I am rich and increaſed with goods, and haue* Revel. 3. 17  
*neede of nothing*: but this I ſay, that all beyng granted that you ſay, doth not hinder but further the cauſe. The more the Church flouriſheth, the more eaſie it is to grant that, which the Arguments pleade for. Miniſters alſo of the word, are as neceſſary for the preſerving and increaſing of the glorie of Churches, as for the procuring thereof at the firſt. But alas I would God our Church did ſo flouriſh as you pretend. Indeed it hath many rich mercyes, God be bleſſed for them; but he that ſeeth not what the Church wanteth, doth not rightly acknowledge that which it hath. Is this the glory of a Church for Prelates to flouriſh



and flant it out gallantly: and for their men to ruffle it out lustily? Nay rather, this is the glory of the world, and better befitting the Courts of Princes, and houses of Noble men, then the calling of *orthodox Bishops*, who should as well in their life as in their doctrine, preach humilitie, modestie, and contempt of the world. The more glorious that Prelats are outwardly, the lesse glorious (for the most part) they are inwardly. Yea it is to be observed, that the more the outward glory of Churchmen (as they are called) hath increased, the more hath true & inward glory decayed. The more also, that the inward and true beauty of the Church hath decayed, the more hath the outward state and pompe of the officers thereof increased. When were the Preists of the law, of greater outward authority, and tooke more upon the, then when the church of the Iewes touching true beauty, was in worst case? *Serch the scriptures for they beare witnes heerof.* Yea, were there ever so many degrees of dignitie in the Church, and doe we ever reade of so great state and pompe of the Preistes in the former tymes, as there was of the Preists, Scribes & Pharises at the first commyng of Christ? And were ever things in so bad case before, as the they were? So also since that, the more that truth of doctrine, and puritie of Discipline decayed in the Church, after the golden and most glorious age of the Apostles, the more did the Church grow unto, and swell in outward riches, pomp and glory. Experience also teacheth, that the more glorious Prelats are in their outward state, the lesse benefite the rest of the Church hath by them; because they take the less paynes; at the least, such paynes, as are most agreable to the true Episcopall and ministeriall calling, described in holy scripture. Wherein then is the true glory of the Church? in  
such



such ministers of the word and other officers; as Christ hath commended. 2 In the performance of such duties by them, as he requyareth, that is in preaching the word faithfully, in administring the Sacraments sincerely, in praying zealously and aptly according to the necessities of the Church, and in executyng Discipline wisely, and justly: 3 In the effects of the former two, viz: in true knowledge, faith, loue, zeale, humility, patience, temperance, righteousness, peace, etc. Touching these things, the more we want som of those officers that Christ hath comended by his Apostles to the Church, and the more negligent those that we haue are in their duties, the more lamentable it is to see the carved pillars of the temple broken downe, and the faithfull workmen in Gods house to be cast out, by whose labors it had been before built & brought to some good bewty. Touching the last, what christian heart is so stony, that it doth not mourne? What eye so drye, that it doth not shed teares, yea rather, gush out with teares, to consider and behold, the mesery of our supposed glorious Church, by the spirituall nakednes, blindnes & poverty therof? I meane the great ignorance, the superficial worship of God, the fearfull blasphemies and swaringes in houses, and streates, so also the direfull cursings, the open contempt of the word & Sacraments, the wicked profanations of the Lords dayes, the dishonor of superiours, the pride, the cruelty, the fornications, adultries, and other uncleanneses, the drunkennes, the covetousnes, the usuryes, and other the like abominations, almost as grevous as either heertofore in the tyme, or now in the places of Popery, when, and where, there was no preaching at all of the gospell? O *M. Powel*, and yee my Reverend Fathers, and brethren in the ministry (even of



the conformable sorte, flatter not your selues in this behalfe, but behold and pity the wofull and lamentable stat of our Church in these things.

But to returne, heerin you erre not a litle, in that you confound the state of the Church, and of the common wealth of the Iewes. The Common wealth was indeed at that time, in much misery. But was the Church also amongst them, for such thinges as wheerin cheifely consisteth misery, in as bad condition? Had they not those officers that God had prescribed? Were the Preists and Levites either so ignorant, or so idle, or so scandalous, as many called Ministers amongst us? Were the faithfull and paynfull Preists and Levites, so urged to the observation of mens traditions and Ceremonies in the worship of God, and otherwise so molested, as now many godly ministers are? Were the people so blind, so irreligious, so unrighteous as now they are? Were the godly forced to heare dumme dogges, or corrupt teachers? Or restrayned from hearing of those that preached wholsome doctrine, or urged to communicate with the Preistes in humaine Ceremonies, to the greife of their soules, and woundiuig of their consciences, as many now are? The Lord giue you all such consideration of these thinges, that yee may not so much labour for outward pompe, preferments, honors, dignities etc. As for the true felicitie of our English *Ierusalem* and *Sion*, that God may build up the *walles* thereof, and still loue, and delight therein.

G. Powel As *Nehemiah* having by prayer and fasting, found favour with an heathen King for the building of *Ierusalem*, was resisted and hindred, by *Sanballat*, *Tobiah*, *Geshem* etcj. So worthy *Nehemiah* in the beginning of our religious Soveraignes reigne, finding grace for the continuance of the prosperous estate of our Church, begunne in the dayes of our blessed Queene, so many *Sanballats*, *Tobiahs* and *Geshems*, as there



there be refractary ministers and Papists, deryding and despising us, labor to hinder our ministry etc.

The ods that before he spake of, now he maketh likes. Is this to dispute *ad idem*, and to the purpose? Reply.

Touching his worthy *Nehemiah* (whom he compareth to auncient good *Nehemiah*,) let this be observed, that although he speake of the prayer and fasting of the auncient *Nehemiah*, yet he speaketh not of any prayer and fasting of his newe *Nehemiah*. What may be suspected or noted heerin, I leaue to the consideration of the wise and judicious reader, that remembreth what opposition many of the Prelats haue alwayes made to true fasting, and that also knoweth what be the thinges which men may safely commēd in prayer unto God, especially, for which they may humble themselues extraordinary in fasting before God. Touching the *Tobiahs*, *Sanballats*, and *Geshems*, (whom fayne he would haue to be those that he calles refractary ministers, as well as the Papists,) let him not deceaue himselfe heerin. For the wise & Christian readers, are able to discerne, thē to be most worthy of these nāes, that striue most for mens precepts, that study more to please men then God, that preach not themselues, and hinder them that would: whose cheefe worke, is not to encrease God his kingdome, but to uphold their owne, fearing nothing more then the downefall therof: which also feed not the Lords people, with the bread of eternall life, but their owne bodyes with the meate that perisheth and with all carnall delights: who care not to enrich the Lords people, with durable riches, that shall not be taken away, but plod day and night to enrich themselues in this world, and to build great house for their posteritie. Such are indeed the *Sanballats*, *Tobiahs*, and *Geshems*, that doe



most oppugne the spirituall building of the spirituall Ierusalem. Now although this answerer, & other not much vnlike those before described, for a tyme reproch and scorne vs, by such odious names and comparisns; yea, *plough upon our backes and make long furrowes*, yet the righteous Lord, in the end shall plead our cause against them, and bring forth our righteousness even as the mornynge Sunne; it may be in this world, that even those that haue been through their raylings, and suggestions against us, hardly perswaded of us, may at the last see and acknowledge our innocency: if not, yet in the world to come, when the longer the equity of our cause hath been obscured and disgraced, the more glorious it shalbe made, when some of our aduersaries (without repentance in the meane time) shall be throwne into the place, where is weeping and gnashing of teeth: and where to be indeed, is more then only to dreame thereof. Yea, the same *righteous Lord shall (certaynely one day) cut the cords of the wicked. They that hate Sion, shall be ashamed, and turned backward.*

psal. 129. 4,

G. Powel

Wee still thinking most of these men to sinne of ignorance, cease not to pray unto God, O Lord open the eyes of these men, and lay not this sinne to their charge.

Reply.

contradiction.

See how this man tumbleth up and downe, and how he contradicteth himselfe. Hath he not before expressly charged *all of us, to doe that which we doe for carnall respectes?* Hath he not also in the same place (I meane in his preface) as expressly sayd, (speaking not particularly of some of us, but indefinitely of all) *that it cannot be denyed, but that presumptuously; and wilfully, we contend with the Magistrate, impugnyng his authority. etc.* How often else wher also doth he object unto us, wilfullnes, obstinacy etc? Yea in the very next Argument, the note with(d) chargeth us with wil-



wilfulnes and superstitious obstinacy : yet here, he sayth that *most of us sinne of ignorance*. If also he and other prayed in truth, that God would open our eyes, then let the not plucke our tongues out of our heads: and so thirst for our bloud, as many speeches in this answer seeme to bewray then to doe.

In *Esters* time, all the Iewes were in danger to haue been swallowed up by *Haman*, if *Queene Hester* had not interceded. I hope the Supplicâts thinke not our Church to be so desperat, neither outwardly nor spiritually.

G. Powel

Reply.

Iosh. 7:11.

2 Sam. 21.

The whole Church of one place, and a whole kingdom, may fare the worse for the sinne of some one: yea, somtims long after the death of him, by whom that sinne was committed. All Israell for the cruelty of *Saule* towards the *Gibeonites* (who yet were not Israelits) were punished, even in their bodily states, long after the death of *Saule*. May we then feare nothing to our whole Church and kingdom, for the hard dealing of the Prelats, towards the soules of many thousands of our owne Nation? *Let no man deceaue us with vayne words. Blessed is the man that feareth alwayes.* There is danger in security, there is much safety in a godly feare. As for the spirituall danger of the Church, it appeareth by the decay of the spirituall beauty, and by the encrease of the spirituall deformitie, that is of ignorance & of impiety, in those places already, which are depriued of their good Ministers. How will these thinges increase in continuance of time? Yet it may be, that as the more the *Ægyptians* by oppression laboured to suppress the Israelits, the more they multiplied: so the more that Prelats shall oppresse and silence us, the more God shall change the mindes of the conformitans themselves, to dislike those thinges, which yet a litle they yeeld unto. If they shall hold their peace, yet God shall open

Ephes. 5.6

Pro. 28.14.

I

reason,



the mouthes of children to giue him prayse, and to beare witness unto his truth: If they also be silent, the Lord can make *even the stones to crye.*

G. Powe, The examples of *Ioseph* and *Nicodemus*, are altogether impertinent. For neither had *Pilat* any reason, to deny the buriall of Christs body: neyther is the ministers request, concerning crosse and surplice, of such importance as the buriall of Christs body: for it is not true that they contend about whole Christ.

Reply.

Sophistry:

Iohn 19. 12

The Argument speaketh of *the honorable buriall of Christs body*, the answerer onely of the buriall, leaving out *honorable*; Is not this sophistry? Though perhaps *Pilate* had no reason, to deny the buriall of Christ; yet Christ being put to death (in part) for supposed treason, he had carnall reason, to deny honorable buriall: the more because of the spite and mallice of the Scribes and Pharises against Christ. For as before, when they sayd, *he that maketh himselfe a King, speaketh against Cesar*, he made the more hast to judgment against him, so he had cause in feare of their like hatred and mallice, to be the slower in granting his body to them to be buried, who he knew in respect of their honorable persons and places, would bury it in the most honorable manner they could. As *Pilat* had cause to feare the mallice of the Scribes and Pharises heerin, so also and much more, had *Ioseph* & *Nicodemus* cause to feare the same, by performyng the least honorable service vnto Christ: especially *Nicodemus*, being one of the same coate might feare it. If the Ministers request concerning Crosse and Surplice, be not of such importance, as the buryall of Christs body, this weakeneth not, but addeth strenght to the Argument. For the lesse it is, the more easily it may be granted, and the more easily it may be granted, the more boldly it may be sued for.

THE SIXTH ARGUMENT.

If



If God respected the teares of reprobate Hagar, in want of water of this life for Ishmaell: and of the women, cruelly used by their husbands. If Christ also pitied many in their bodily miseries, yea some, that being heathen, were in that respect little better then doggs; then much more this Honorable Court, ought to pity the moene and lamentation of many Congregations, deprived of their faithfull Pastors, for want of the water and bread of eternall life, which sometime the sayd Pastors, were wont to giue unto them.

Gen. 21. 16  
Malachi 2:  
13:14:  
Mat: 15:22.

But the first is true, Ergo. The second ought to be performed; & consequently, the Honorable High Court of Parliament, ought to speake for those Ministers and people, that doe so mourne.

Marginall notes.

G. Powel

a The refractarie ministers, ought to haue had compassion on their sheepe, and not desperatly to haue forsaken them for crosse & surplice.

We must so haue compassion one our sheepe, that we wound not our owne soules. We must (as hath been sayde) *eschew evill, and doe good*: not commit evill, to doe good. As gold may be bought to deere, so may the good of our people. That which is heere said against us touching crosse and surplice, may also be sayd touching images, if we were commaunded to worship them, Our yeelding also would be so offensiuē, that we should not doe that good, that we intend by yeelding. We may also feare the hardenyng of our heartes by yeelding, as well as we see the hearts of other by litle sinnes, to be hardned for greater.

Reply.

The note with (b) is often anserwred.

c Absurd. The woman was such, as that Christ himselfe testified of G. Powel her, that he had not found so great faith in Israell. Read the place.

Reply.

Absurd. Our Saviour speaketh not that of that womā, Math: 8. 10. but of the Centurion. Though the Notary were an Arch-bishop, yet I might intreat him, better to read the place.



Mat. 15. 23.

374

Sophistrie.

But Christ sayd, *O woman, great is thy faith?* What then? Though as shee was elect, she was also blessed: yet as she was out of the visible Church, the words of our Saviour might be spoken of her. Neither doth the author say, that she was a dogge: but that she was litle better then a dogg, & in that respect, that is, as she was a Cananit, & none of the children of Israell. Is ther no difference betwixt these words, & to say plainly, that she was a dog? Yet the words of our Saviour are playne. *It is not meete to take the childrens bread, & to cast it to dogs, or whelps.* Therefore this note repro veth our Saviour, and not the author of the Arguments.

The two next scoffing notes with (d) and (e) haue been often answered. We leaue not our flockes in the playne field, but are driven from them by force, because we will not displease God, to please the Prelats.

G. Powel

f Onely Christ is the husband of his spouse. Heere the supplicants blasphemously papize. For I thinke they meane not this literally. If they doe, they are surely very honest men in the meane time:

Reply.

Math: 7. 5

Sophistry

*A man should first cast out the beame that is in his owne eye, before he find fault with a mote in another mans eye.* As Christ is the onely Archbishop of the Church, so I acknowledg him also the onely husband of his spouse. For the one ti- tle, is as proper unto Christ, as the other. But heere the Notary falleth agayne, over head and eares, into the same sophistry, that in the former note with (c) he did. The au- thor sayth, that such Ministers had performed the duety as it were of husbands; the notary cryeth out blasphemy, as if he had simply called them, the husbands of the chur- ches. The author therefore, did not blasphemously papize. But let other take heed of like papizing, that usurpe such names and authority, as are proper onely to Christ; and neither are, nor can be maynteyned by any other Argu- ments,



ments, then such as wherby the Papall dignity of the Antichrist of Rome is supported. The latter part of the note is to lothsome for any Christian tongue to reade, or chaste eares to heare: therefore I cast it out on the dunghill, as vnworthy of any answer.

g A lying hyperbole:

G. Powel

Then belike the Prophet *Malachi*, (upon alleaging of *Reply* whose words this note is grounded) used a *lying hyperbole*. *Mala: 2, 13:* God that putteth up all the teares of his children into his <sup>14</sup> bottle, knoweth and beholdeth this, and will one day, *Rom 12, 15* wpe away these, and all other teares from their eyes: when they *Iob. 30, 25* that in the meane time scorne such teares of the godly (so *Amos 6, 6* farr are they from mournyng with them that mourne, and being sory for the afflictions of Ioseph) shall except they repent) haue more, then their bellyes full of weeping and waylyng, and gnashing of teeth.

h If the refractary Ministers be so unkind, and hard hearted, that they will haue no pity upon them, then may they be otherwise releued well inough: G. Powel.

*Reply.*

The Lord that searcheth the heartes of all men, knoweth the affections of some of the Ministers now deprived, to be such towards their people, that if they might stay with their people with comfortable conditions, they had rather stay, (though their maintenance be but small) then accept of a thousand pound by the yeare else where with as good conditiōs. Therefore hardnes of heart is not to be objected vnto them. Touching the rest of this note, it is strange, that in the question of depriving ignorant Ministers, according to the law & statute in that behalfe, this hath ben the principall objection, where, or how, wil you haue their places supplied? Much like to the question of the Disciples, *whence should we get so much bread in the wildernes, as should suffice so great a multitude?* Now the



question being of our deprivation against law, and the paucity of sufficient Ministers being objected, reply is made, *There is store, the Churches may be releevd otherwise.* But let them be first releevd, that haue ignorant Ministers, not knowing the principles of religion themselves, much lesse able to teach other.

*Further answer to the 6. Argument.*

G. Powel If such congregations doe so mourne, then the more hard hearts haue those cruel tyrants rather then shepherds, that without pity, desperately forsake them, for litle or no cause:

*Reply.*

The substance of these wordes being the same with the former note, is answered before: yet here I ad, 1 that it is more cruelty for the Prelats, for litle or no cause to depriue such Pastors. 2 that this answerer seemeth still to account, sinning against God to be litle or nothing. 3. that a theefe by the like reason, may complayne of the hardnes of his heart, that had rather lose his Purse, then haue his throate cut.

G. Powel

Those Congregations may cease mourning, and comfort themselves, because there is store inough of able Ministers, and they shall haue those, that will not run away from them:

*Reply.*

Take away tautologies and other superfluities, and this answer it selfe would scarce haue been an obular or two farthing pamphlet. The first part of this answer, hath been removed before. Those that will not runne away, where are they to be found? What net may one haue to ketch them, what keepe to hold them? For doe not the Formalists dayly run away from their people? Doe they not take another lyving, and keep the former also, leaving one to some journeyman, fit for all companyes? Yea, both Master & man, oftentimes leave both flocks to the *Wolfe*, yea, I knowe some that for sake their owne charges, and are curats else where under other. And to whome doe  
some



377

some of them leaue their owne? To one, that all the week long goeth to hedging, ditchyng, throslyng, and other day labor for his livyng: who on the Lordes day, is at Church, with a white Surplice to read service. In harvest also they take harvest worke, as ordinarily as other harvest men. I haue seene it, not long since with my eyes. Some also within a fortnight after they are possessed of a living, of good worth, let it out for divers yeares, and so take their leaue of the people, to serue a cure under another. O miserable condition of such a people. Whose heart melteth not to think of such wretched watchmen? What liklyhod therefore is there, that the Congregations deprived of their godly, loving & paynefull Pastors, shall haue other as faithfull, that will not run away from them? Touching the answer to the consequence of the former Argument, that the Pastors should rather *returne to their people and comfort them, obeying the wholsome ordinances of the Church etc.* I answer that we will so doe, when such ordinances are proved by Gods word to be wholsome.

## THE 7 ARGUMENT.

*All true Ministers, are as the Chariots and horsmen of those kingdomes where they are. In the Ministry of the gospell, and sincere worship of God therein commended, consisteth the glory of Kings and kingdomes. So also the peace: yea also their whole outward prosperity. And the contempt of the gospell and of the sincere worship of God, procureth all outwarde calamities of Kings and Kingdomes.* Ergo

2 king. 2, 12  
& 13. 14  
Prov. 3. 16  
psal. 45. 12  
1 Sam. 4, 21  
Ephes. 6. 5  
Isai. 2:4 and  
65: 25:  
2 chren, 14:

*As men wilbe faithfull to Kings and Kingdomes, so they must mainteyne the sincere Ministry and Ministers of the gospell; and therefore speake for them.*

14, 17, 10:  
27.6,

## The Marginall Notes.

a Is a handfull of refractary ministers, the safety of the whole land:

I 4

Cosmo- G. Powel



378  
Reply.

**I** *Cosmographers* in some Maps describe a bird called a *Ruc*, of such bignes, that she taketh vp an *Elephant* with her talants very high into the ayre, and then letteth him fall to be broken and bruised, for her to feed on. It seemeth, this Notary hath an hand as large as the foote or tallants of this bird, sith he maketh but an handfull of all the Ministers suspended, deprived, or like so to be, for these matters now in question. Secondly, As the loss of one of his Majesties shippes Royall, or of one of his strongest holdes, or of one of his most worthy warriors, may be sayde to weaken the whole Kingdome, especially in the time of great warre: and as the cutting in sunder of one principall post, or beame or pillar of an house, doth weaken the whole house; so, and much more is the losse & cutting of of so many worthy ministers of the gospel, the weakenyng of the whole land. For is not Satan, and are not Papists, and all the rest of Satans army, so much the more strenghtned? *Elia* was but one, and accounted (as we are) *a troubler of Israell*: and left *Elisha* behind him: and yet the Argument telleth you; how they were accounted, though in their tyme there were many other Prophets. O therefore, that the meanest able and godly Minister, might not be lightly regarded, in these last and dangerous tymes. Howsoever they are esteemed of by the world, yet they are of more price, then great riches.

2 king. 2, 15  
and 9. 1.

**G. Powel** **b** As if God never had defended any Pagan, in case of innocency and justice etc:

**c** Outward prosperity consisteth in pure worship: They speake so profoundly, as an intelligent and sensible man, cannot understand them: As if the ungodly florished not oft tymes, as a greene bay tree: and the outward prospeity of the *Persians* and *Romanes*, did not surpassse the meane estate of the *Iewes*, the true Church of God:

If there had been no name set to this booke, these two  
notes,

Reply



notes, and many other the like, might haue brought it in  
 suspition to haue been penned by some professed *Atheist*.  
 For ( who almost but smelling of religion,) would haue  
 objected such things? Yea, who that had but tasted of lo-  
 gike, would haue denyed the conclusion, not regarding  
 the proofes and premises? The wicked doe indeed, some  
 times in joye outward prosperity, either to mollifie their  
 owne hearts, or to harden them the more to be the fitter  
 for Gods judgmentes, or to be scourges of God unto o-  
 ther: or to make them the more in excusable: yet they  
 haue no assurance, either of getting, or of holdyng such  
 prosperity. Neyther can they haue any more comfort  
 thereby: then the godly may haue discomforte by their  
 afflictions: because indeed they haue no intrest thervnto  
 from God. It is also a shamefull untruth, that the *Persians*,  
*Romans*, or any other, in outward prosperity excelled the  
*Iewes*, so long as the *Iewes* regarded the word, honored  
 the Prophets and other Ministers thereof, and mayntey-  
 ned the pure worship of God. All that while, they were  
 even in outward things the glory of all the world. What  
 people ever had the like victoryes? What Nation for all  
 prosperity was comparable to *Israell* in the dayes of *Salomon*,  
 and to the *Iewes* afterward, in the time of many other  
 Kings? Of what Citie are so glorious things ever written  
 as of *Ierusalem*? Read the places in the margine. Indeed af-  
 ter that they contemned the word of the Lord, abused  
 his prophets, and neglected God his worship (and that e-  
 specially through the fault of their Preists etc.) then the  
 Lord forsaking them, made their enemyes the cheife etc.

psal: 48:2:  
 87:2: & 12:  
 Lamēt. 1:1  
 and 2:1:

Lament: 1:5

The other notes upon this Argument, I passe by, as ei-  
 ther answered before, or being of no moment.

*Further answer to the 7 Argument.*

K

What



G. Powel

Reply.

Sophistry :

G. Powel

Reply.

What can a sensible man make of this *enthymem*? The refractory ministers are the safety of the whole land, Ergo, the Court of Parliament must speake for the gospel.

The title refractory omitted, he is a sensible man, that can make nothing of that *enthymem*: especially these ministers pleaded for, being proved true and faithfull. For though the gospel and Ministers thereof be distinct, yet he that speaketh for one, speaketh for both, and he that speaketh for both, speaketh for the land, the safety wherof dependeth upon both. But marke heere agayne, the answerers sophistry; For whereas the author saith, that the Parliament is to speake for the gospel & Ministry thereof, the answerer taketh the word gospel, and altogether leaveth out, the other words, and the ministry thereof.

There are thousandes of faithfull Ministers besides them in this kingdome, that are Charets and horsemen etc. Ministers are therefore termed Charets and horsemen, because they are Gods instruments for gathering of the Saints, Ergo: The antecedent is improbable, if not false: Againe, these men refuse their Ministry, wherfore they cannot be called charets: yea so farre are they from being the safety, that would God they were not the sores of the Church, and sowers of sedition. I meane schisme and faction:

As there are some other faithfull Ministers, so there are not many thousands that are able, much lesse faithfull besides us. Generally throughout the land, there are Sixe reading ministers, for one preacher, at the least by practis. For there are some that are licensed to preach, that never did, are, or were able to preach. Many also that can preach seldom doe Preach. Some also that doe preach, (and that often) doe it so Popishly or otherwise so corruptly: so foolishly and ridiculously, to make sporte rather then to edifie: so vaynly and unprofitably, that it were better to hold their peace then so to preach.

That Ministers are called charets and horsemen for gathering



thering the Saints, ( viz: out of the power and holdes of the Devill) may be the truth in part: but yet, they being (in the places alleaged ) called the charets and horsmen of Israel, not of the Saints, (and most of the Israelits being then wicked) and these titles being acknowledged of *Elisba* by a wicked King, that respected not the gathering of the Saints, but the outward defence of his kingdome, by the prayers and preaching of *Elisba*: it cannot be the whole truth. That we are such sores as the answerer speaketh of, is not proved. Indeed some conformitans so account us, because we rub their sores so much, and desire so earnestly the healing of them, that so their soules may be the better saved. We are also eye-sores to them: but sure I am, that we are not so to the godly, many of whose sores, God hath cured by us, and to whom our ministry hath been *the savor of life, unto life*. Other things in this argument, haue received their reply.

## THE 8 ARGUMENT.

*The proceedings of the Bishops & other Ecclesiasticall Iudges against the Ministers in silencing and depriving of them, is against the law, Ergo.*

*This High Court of Parliament, being the chiefest Court of iustice in all this kingdome, ought to releue them.*

*The marginall notes upon the 8 Argument.*

The first 3 notes I passe by; as note-les.

d Object against these, and you shall be answered:

How shall we be answered? With words, and raylings, as before, not otherwise. To the oth *Ex Officio*, and to the *Canons* afterward.

G. Powel  
Reply.

a These men would bring in all by popular triall:

Nay rather, would not the Prelats be glad to haue all persons and all causes subject to themselues? But more to

G. Powel  
Reply.



382

this afterward.

G. Powel

Reply

b A senses sentence: How can a man in matters of eternall life, be cast out of his freehold:

A simple cavill, from the misplacing of a comma. The Notary might well haue perceived, that these wordes, (*in matters of eternall life,*) were to be joynd with the words goyng before, *ambassadors of Iesus Christ*, not with the words following, *should be cast out of their freehold*. This I say he might well haue perceived, because there had been no speech of our freehold of eternall life, but only of this life.

G. Powel

Reply.

c The Ecclesiasticall judge may proceed Ex officio: (d) directly against the statute, 1 Elizab:cap:2

These two notes being in the margine contiguous, and touching one another, I joyne together in my reply; the rather because (d) the letter of the second note, and the mention of the statute in the end of the sayd second note omitted, they may both in better sense and truth, be read thus together, *Ecclesiasticall Iudges may proceed ex officio, directly against the statute*. For touching the former note with (c) let the best *Civilian* shew (if he can) by what other law, the Ecclesiasticall judge may proceed *ex officio*, then by the Canon law abolished by statute. The second note with (d) shall be satisfied afterward.

The note with (e) of begging the question, is now too stale.

G. Powel

Reply

f As if God and his Sonne Christ Iesus were not president of the religious assembly already: An unchristian suggestion:

When the Prophet exhorteth the Church, *to open her dores for the King of glory to come in*: did he signifie that the Church had not before interteyned the *King of glory*? When Christ saith, *Open unto me my sister etc.* doth he meane that his sister had him not at all before? Christ dayly knocketh

psal. 24, 7:9

Cant: 5: 2:



keth by his word and Sacraments, at the heartes of all the faithfull to be let in. Are they therefore altogether without Christ? Allthough therefore Christ be already president in the Parliament, yet by the propounding of any good cause, he desireth to be further interteyned amongst them. This the author hath acknowledged, by calling the often a Christian assembly: by commending their Christian zeale against the Papists etc. But this is the answerers sophistry before noted, to reason from the want of a thing in part, to the want thereof altogether. Therefore this is an vnchristian and simple collection.

*Further answer to the 8 Argument.*

I am constrained to dance as the suppliants Pipe: They lead, and I followe. G. Powel  
Reply.

*Nay we haue piped unto you, and yee haue not danced. We haue mourned unto you, and yee haue not lamented.* Neither to evident Argumentes out of holy scripture, will you submit your human ordinances, or your selues: neither by any gentle and humble petitions, will yee Prelats come to any brotherly peace. Mildnes doth as much provoke you as bitternes. *M. Nichols* of Kent, writyng most mildly and humbly, was rewarded severely, with suspension, deprivation, degradation. Our most humble petition to the Convocation, at the first Sesssion of this Parliament, received a most rough answer. *We seeke peace, and when we speake thereof, ye are bent to warre.* As though yee fate in heavenly places, we haue been unto you more vile then the earth. I complaine not thus of all the Prelats. I know that some are wiser, milder, kinder, and more curteous the other. As the bramble took more upon it, then the Olive tree, the vine or the fig tree, so sometyme it is among Prelats.

Hitherto they prayed your Honors but to speake for them etc. Now they urge you to determyne, and actually to decree something



in their behalfe:

G. Powel We neither prayed nor urged any thing to be doone, but with all humility and loyalty : hoping that his most excellent Majesty vpon the sight of the reasons, why they had decreed or determined any thing (so farre as they might among themselves) would likewise in his Princely and christian regard, haue vouchafed his Royall assent to their such decrees and determinations : which although it haue not pleased his Highnes yet to doe, yet we hope that heerafter upon further cōsideration, some other may find further grace with his Majestie in the like behalfe.

G. Powel To the consequence of the former Argument:

The consequence hath 2 parts, whereof the first is granted, but that the deprived and suspended ministers ought to be restored is denyed, because they haue not justified their cause, and declared that they are vnjustly oppressed, nor can ever doe:

*Reply.*

Touching the former answer, may it please the reader, first to remember, that all the authors speech of the proceedings of the Bishops against Ministers suspended etc: is only to be understood of such Ministers, as whom they suspend and depriue, onely for such causes as are mentioned in the title of the Argumentes, not of other whom they suspend or depriue for any just cause. Now to proceede, that such Ministers haue not yet in law (whereof the present question is) justified there cause, and declared that they are unjustly oppressed, nor can ever doe, is not for want of matter of justification, or for want of the truth of unjust oppression (I meane only by the Prelats) but because they haue not been admitted, to prosecute the iustice of the land, nor to call in question the proceedings of their ordinaryes : who haue been hitherto both Agents and Iudges ; both accusers and advocats in their owne cases against them. And especially because upon pre-



pretense of a *Canon* lately made, (repugnant to the lawes, statutes; and customes of the Realme) they be not suffered by the *Archbishops Iudge ad quem*, to plead and to prosecute their appeales, and to declare their innocency according to the auncient laudable, and common usage and iustice of the land: unto which grevance also many more exorbitant injustices (by the Prelats) heereafter mentioned may be added. Let the answerer therefore vnderstand, that som Ordinaryes in their publike sentēces, haue most uniuersally charged some Ministers, with denyall of the oth to the Kings supremacy: which notwithstanding, divers tymes before, they had willingly sworne vnto, and which at the very instance of pronouncyng the sentence, they offered before their Ordinary to sweare unto agayne. And not onely thus lesingly, (to make the Persons of the sayd Ministers more odious to our most Christian King, his State, and all his people) in their publike sentences of deprivation, haue som Ordinaryes traduced the good name and estimation of the Ministers, but also without any other speciall crime worthy deprivation mentioned in their sentences, haue they stuffed their sentences full, only with generall wordes of generall crimes, contrary to the right forme of judgment. For by right forme of judgment, the Ordinaryes ought not to haue impeached the Ministers, because of generall crymes, but they ought to haue sayd, and put in certeyne, in what thinges, and in what manner the sayd ministers haue done any thing worthy punishment of deprivation.

The Bishop  
of Lincolne  
against the  
the Mini-  
sters of Lei-  
cestershire.

An other grevance & unjust oppression (by the sayd Prelats) of the sayd silenced ministers, is, that upon sentence of deprivation and appeales of the Ministers, the Ordinaryes haue given notice to the Patron of the voy-



386

Old natura  
brevium fol  
33. Que  
breife ne ser  
grant, avant  
que level-  
que de tiel  
lieu eit certi  
fie en le Chā  
cerie per sō  
breit de tiel  
resistance.

dance of the Church, and upon new presentation of the Patron, haue not onely instituted new clarkes; but also (to avoyd the possession of the Minister deprived and appealing) haue suggested and intimated by their certificatory writ, under their publike seale unto the King, into his Court of Chancery, that the possession of the church was kept *per vim laicam*, & withall haue prayed the Kings writ *de vi laica removenda*. By vertue of which writ (upon their suggestion & intimation) granted, (for without their suggestion and intimation it would not be granted) the party appellant, before the appeale finished, hath ben removed out of his possession by the Shiriffe of the Coũty. Notwithstanding in truth, the Church, parsonage or vicarage house, had within the same, no manner of *vilai- ca* at all: but was onely quietly and peaceably possessed, by the late derived spirituall person, and his poore family.

And that this manner of a possession of a Church, by a spirituall person and his family, by the law of the Kingdome, is not to be holden *vis laica*, is playnly iustified, by a late judgment given by the Kings Iustices, touching the possession of the Church of *Newton Valence* in the Diocesse of *Winton*. For whereas a spirituall person possessed of the same Church, by vertue of the Kings writ *de vi laica removenda*, was removed out of his possession, and another spirituall person put in possessiō of the same church; the spirituall person dispossessed, upon the matter heard and examined, before the Kings Iustices, that he was a mere spirituall person, and that his Church was possessed onely by himselfe, and his domestikes, was by an other of the Kings writs restored into, and possessed of the same Church; and which Church unto this day, he peaceably holdeth and injoyeth.



Bishop of  
Chichester  
& Salisbury

A 4 grevance of the silenced Ministers, is that (ther being a *Canon* made in the last *Synod*, that *no iudge ad quem* shall grant any Inhibition to the judge *a quo*, unless he first see the originall appeale) sundry Ordinaryes upon appeales made before them, haue taken order with their Registers and Notaryes, not to deliver to the partyes appellant, any noate or copy of any act or sentence, made or given before them. Where upon not onely the party appellant is wronged, but the Notary also upon refusall of granting to the party appellat (demaunding and tendring to the Notary his fee) a publike instrument of the publike Acts and Records of the Court, cannot but incurre the infamy of corruption and perjury: in as much as he being a publike Notary, is sworne faithfully to execute the office of a publik Notary; the execution of part of which office, consisteth (he being requyred thereunto) in his testimony and delivery of the publike acts made in his presence.

A fith injustice or rather nullity is, because sundry sentences of deprivation haue been given *a Indicibus non suis*, namely by such Ordinaryes, whose power and jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall at the time of giving their sentēces, was suspended, shut up and closed, by the *Archbishop* of *Canterburyes* Commission, and his Archiepiscopall visitation.

A 6 grevance or rather a nullity is, because the whole power and jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, touching causes criminal, without exception or reservation of the examination and definition of the crimes of Ministers, by sundry Diocefans under their seale at armes, before that tyme was committed *in solidum* for terme of life & yeares not expired unto their principall Commissaryes, Officialls, or vicars generall: wherupon it consequently followeth, the

L

same



388

same Diocesans having nopower by the Kings Ecclesiasticall lawes, to resume at their pleasure their sayd Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, that the sentences given by the sayde *Diocesans*, in these cases are sentences voyd and of none effect in the law, as being given *a Iudicibus iurisdictione in ea parte carentibus*.

A 7 grevance, or rather nullity is, that sentences haue been given *nullo Iuris ordine seruato*: but *omni iuris ordine spreto et neglecto*.

An 8 injustice is, because some acts and sentences haue been made and given in some private chamber of some common Inne or Taverne, and not in *publico et competente foro*, in any publike or competent seate, of Ecclesiasticall justice. As *M. Vinall* and *M. Warren*, in the Diocesse of *Chichester* were deprived, in a common Taverne, viz. at the signe of the *Ounce* and *Ivy bush* in *Greensted*.

The 9 injustice is, because some sentences, given by some Ecclesiasticall judges, for not use of rites and Ceremonies, or not observing of the booke of Common prayer, haue not been given according to the tenor of and effect of the statute of the first of our late *Queene*, vpon inquisition, information, or accusation, but only upon proces *ex mero officio*. A thing if not directly, yet by consequence repugnant to the sayd statute: and therefore unwarrantable by the sayd statute. And therefore it is to be noted, that this marginall note (the Ecclesiasticall judge may proceed *ex officio*) in pag 37. and this *parenthesis* (which they may doe *ex officio*) inserted in the body of the statute pag 42. is but a begging of the question.

Certain Ministers in the Dioces of Oxford & Lichtfeld etc.

An other injustice against some Ministers hath been committed by some ordinaries, for that they haue deprived them for none other cause, then only for not subscribing to



to the 3 articles, mentioned in the 36. Canon. And this wrong hath been openly in Parliament acknowledged, to be a wrong by the Archbishop himselfe, and by the Iudges and advocats of his owne Courts.

These and many such like thinges being thus, may it not be truely sayd, that the Ministers pleaded for are unjustly oppressed? And being so oppressed and without reliefe any other way, haue they not just cause to supplicat to the High Court of Parliament? And hath not the sayd High Court great reason, yea is it not bound to finde remedy, and to relecue them?

The answer concernyng the person of him who is sayd abundantly to haue proved the unlawfulness of the proceedings against the deprived ministers, that he is *no iudge nor any good Civilian or common lawyer*, what reason haue you to be so resolut heerin? He may be a judge, a good Civilian, or cōmon lawyer for ought you knowe, though you seeme never so doubtles therof. But what is this answer to the poynt in question? Seeing it mattereth not, what the person of the probator be, if his proofes be sufficient? And yet how meane so ever you thinke him, or his learning to be (if he be the party whom I ayme at) I shall doe no wrong (as I suppose to the cheefest judge, and best approved Civilian, of the now Archbishop of *Canterburys* courts, if (without flattering the party) I shall affirme that he was a student and an advocate, and a Iudge, yea, I may (as I thinke) say more, a reader of and a director in the practise of the civill law about 30 yeares passed, to sōe that be now Doctors of the same law.

But to let the person and learnyng of the probator passe, I resolutely and directly answer to the answerers 3.

*Queres* (the same being partly fraught with *equivocations*,



1 Quere.

Equivocati-  
ons.

and partly childish and absurd,) that the one sorte can receive no resolute answer, before he have resolved his intrinsecall and mentall sense and understanding, and that the other without question, is a question questionles. His first *Quere* then being this, namely, *whether the Church under Christian godly Magistrats, hath any tribunall proper unto it selfe, for the decyding of controversies, and punishing of such persons as shall refuse the ordinances therof?* Unto this *Quere*, when he shall distinguish and make his so many *equivocations* (conteyned in the *Quere*) prespicuous and playne, to the understanding of every simple & playne meanyng man, I shall (God willing) make him a simple, playne, resolute, & direct answer. In the meane time let him understand, first that we may justly doubt, what he meaneth by the word Church: and namely, whether he meane the universall Church; or a Nationall, a Provinciall, a Diocesā, an Archidiaconall, a Decanall, a Capitular, or lastly a Parochiall Church. For all men (as usually and commonly we speake) doe vnderstand, that every of these Churches, hath her proper name, after which she is so called: as namely the Church dispersed throughout the world, is called the universall Church, the Church within England is commonly called the Nationall Church of England; the Church within the Province of Canterbury, the Provinciall Church of Canterbury, the Church of the Diocesse of London, the Diocesan Church of London, etc. And lastly the Church of great *S. Ellens* in London, the Parochiall Church of *S. Ellens* in London. And therefore I craue a resolute and direct answer, of what onely persons you meane that the universall, this Nationall, Provinciall, Diocesan, Archidiaconall, Decanall, Capitular, and Parochiall Church consisteth? Who onely be the Christian godly Magistrats, under whom every one of these



Churches liveth? Whether the same christian godly Magistrates may personally be present, giue their expresse consents, and haue their decisive voyces, to & in making all and every decrees of every of these Churches? What is the tribunall proper to it selfe, of every of these Churches? What onely manner of controversies, by every of these Churches may be decided? What onely kind of ordinances, every of these Churches may decree? What onely kind of subject, and with what onely kind of punishment, and none other, every of these Churches may punish the refusers of every their ordinances?

Our second mayne scruple, touching this first *Quere*, ariseth from these words (*under Christian godly Magistrats*) For if by these words (*under Christian godly Magistrats*) he understand that every of these Churches, livyng under the obeyfance of such Magistrats, hath a tribunall proper unto it selfe, immediatly derived to the same by the holy law of God, wholly seclused from the Christian godly Magistrats presence (as was the Sanctuary divided from the Court) and wherinto the christian godly Magistrats may no more at this day enter, or no more giue their consents and decisive voyces, in making the ordinances thereof, then it was lawfull in times past for the Kings of *Inda* to enter into the holy place, and to burne incense at the Altar: then must we frame him one kinde of reply: but if he shall informe us, his mentall vnderstanding to be thus, namely that the Christian godly Magistrats, haue none other power, by law divine or human, but only to assemble every of the sayd Churches, to ratifie the ordinances of every of the sayd Churches, or hath onely power to commaund the same ordinances to be put in execution under them, then unto this answer we must shape him



an other manner of reply. Notwithstanding, in the meane tyme this he must understand generally, that in right (though not alwayes in possession & practise) the church beyng distinguished from the common wealth, hath the same power under a Christian, and under an Infidell Magistrat.

G. Powel

2 Quere.

Whether so many judicall acts of deprivation of Bishops from their benefices since the conquest, to the time of *Magna Charta*, and since that to this age, were ever held to be contrary to the lawes of this Kingdome?

Reply.

To dance after your Pipe, (I will not say, what a foolish and ridiculous question, but) what an od tune is this? For can a man dance after a pipe, before the Pipe be stricken up? So could acts done before *Magna Charta*, and other lawes since made, be sayd to be contrary to them? This is as much, as one should aske, whether *Adam* not Circumcising *Cain* and *Abell*, did contrary to the law given for Circumcision, to *Abraham* many yeares after? Or whither *Ishmael* persecuted *Isaack*, before *Isack* was borne? Or whether stealing of horses an hundred yeares past, were punishable with death, before any law made for death in that behalfe? One thing cannot be sayd contrary to an other, that is not, neyther ever was extant *in rerum natura*. The Second part of this *Quere*, whether since the granting of *Magna Charta* unto this age, the judicall acts of deprivation of Bishops etc: were ever held to be contrary to the law of this kingdome, and *Magna Charta*, we

G. Powel

3 Quere.

shall answer (if God permit) more plentifully anone.

3 Quere. Whether any Iudge of this Realme, or any cheife officers lerned in the lawes, be of opinion, that such sentences of deprivation, as have lately passed in due forme, in any Ecclesiasticall Court, be contrary to any, much lesse to many statuts.

Reply.

Though it were a sufficient answer to bid him goe  
looke



looke, and himselfe to aske the opinion of every judge & learned officer, yet will I not altogether yeld him so short and cutted an answer. And though it be a principle in Philosophy, that *forma dat esse rei*, yet to the beyng of every thing there must be matter, to which the forme giveth being. And therefore in this case, besides due forme, there must be also due matter, inserted in due sentences. Whereupon I craue a resolute and direct answer, whether by those words (*passed in due forme*) he meane passed for *matter and forme*, in due forme? Or whether he meane, passed without *due matter* in due forme onely? For if he meane by passed, (*for matter and forme*), *in due forme*, then is his question (without question) either a foolish question, or no question at all. For who would question, whether any Iudge or learned officer, could doubt, that a sentence passed for matter, and forme in due forme, were a sentence contrary to any, much lesse to many statuts? As though there were any Statuts so ridiculous and absurd? On the other side, if he meane by *passed in due forme*, only due forme without due matter, then we answer that the same sentence may be unjust, for want of due matter, and yet be just by reason of due forme. And so on the other parte, we affirme, that a sentence may be iust, by reason of due matter, and yet unjust by reason of an undue forme. How many sentences therefore of deprivation soever, as haue been lately given without due and just matter, or without due and iust forme, we answer so many not to haue passed in due matter and forme, and so <sup>to be</sup> contrary to some lawes or statuts. But were this question wholly grated, what ease and advantage can the opinion of any iudg or learned officer yeeld to those Iudiciall acts of deprivation (whereupon the controversie is grounded) which are



394

not passed in any due forme of any law, or Statute Ecclesiasticall whatsoever?

Furthermore touching this question, if the Prelats did intend that all their sentēces should be according to law, wherefore did they make a *Canon* against the ordinary prosecution of appeales? Yea, what needed such a *Canon*? What benefite is there to any appellant by his appeale, from a just sentence? Or what danger to the Iudge *a quo* by such appeales? The whole danger is to the appellant himselfe. For the sentence beyng just, he shall be sure to get nothing, neither the Iudge *a quo* to lose any thing by the appeale.

G. Powel.

VVho having but halfe an eye, doth not see, but that (by pleading *Magna Charta* cap. 29: ) they would not onely weaken, but also subvert and utterly overthrow all jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall?

Reply.

Doth every one that desireth limitation of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and laboreth to restrayne it from all communion of forreyne lawes, seeke the subversion thereof? If also the lawes Ecclesiasticall, be the Kings Ecclesiasticall lawes, and the jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, the Kings Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, then is this place of *Magna Charta*, so farre from subverting the jurisdiction or law Ecclesiasticall, as that by that place, the same law and jurisdiction is up held, and more thoroughly established.

That the law & jurisdiction Ecclesiastical ever hath been, and yet is accounted the Kings Ecclesiasticall law and jurisdiction shall be shewed anone.

G. Powel

The sentences and graue determinations whereof (that is of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction) haue never yet in any age or Country, been submitted to popular triall, by the judgment of *Peeres* etc:

Reply

All sentēces of Ecclesiasticall Courts, are not so graue but that some are somtymes repealed by Higher courts, and sometymes revoked by themselues. Sometime also they



they meddle with matters not belonging unto them, and therefore by ordinary course of Common law, they are prohibited to proceed. Finally in some case the Bishop giveth not Institution to a benefice, untill by a Jury of 12. men (whereof 6. are to be of the Clergy, and 6 of the Layity) the controversie *de iure patronatus* be decided. Yea sometyme the Bishop having instituted a clark, is forced by writ from the common law, to admit of another clark presented by another Patrone, and so to displace him whom before he had instituted.

G. Powel

The place of *Magna Charta*, cannot be understood of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, or the practise thereof, especially if we consider the end why this law was made, and the tyme when:

The Prelats should make sure worke indeed, if they could make, that no lawes were against their power. They might they take upon them without controlment, what they would under coloure of *Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction*: as indeed they doe now pretily beginne to doe.

Reply.

The end was, that the Kings of this Realme, might not challenge an infinit and absolute power, (as some Kings else where did, and yet doe) without judgment and lawfull proceedings, to take away any mans liberty, life, Country, goods, or lands.

G. Powel

Then belike the Kings Majestie is restrayned by *Magna Charta*, but the Prelacy is not. Is not this good stuffer? The King shall weare the Crowne, but the Prelats will beare the sword. Whether now doe they that are falsely called *Puritans*, or the *Prelats* most encroch upon the Roy all authoritye?

Reply.

It was made at such time, as the Kings thought Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, no more in right then in fact, to belong to the Crowne. Therefore the words have no relation to Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction.

G. Powel

This is utterly false: yea the falshood therof is evident by the testimony of that worthy and renowned Lawyer *S. Edward Coke*, in the booke alleadged by the answerer.

Reply

M

For



39.6

lib. de jure  
regis Eccle.  
fol. 8

For he sayth exprefely, that *as in temporall caufes, the King by the mouth of Iudges in his Courts of Iuftice, doth iudge the fame by the temporall lawes of England; fo in caufes Ecclefiasticall etc. ( the conuifance wherof doth not belong to the common lawes of England ) the fame are to be iudged and determyned, by Ecclefiasticall Iudges, according to the Kings Ecclefiasticall lawes, etc.*

fol. 39

And againe, *obferue good reader, (sayth S. Edward Cooke) feeing that the determination of heresies etc. belongeth not to the Common law, how neceffary it was for adminiftration of Iuftice, that his Maiefties progenitors Kings of this Realme, did by publike authority authorize Ecclefiasticall Courts under the, to determine thofe great and important caufes, etc. by the Kings Ecclefiasticall lawes. The iurisdiction therfore, Courts, and lawes Ecclefiasticall, in the opinion of the Kings progenitors were thought & held to be their own Kingly lawes, Courts, and iurisdiction. The fame is further proved by the fayd S. Edward Cooke: by the president of Rcnulphus, in difcharging and exempting the Monaftery and Abbot of Abinden, from the iurisdiction of the Bifhops and granting alfo to the faide Abbot Ecclefiasticall iurisdiction etc: by the president of William the firft, who made inpropriatio of Churches with cure, to Ecclefiasticall perfons etc. and by divers presidents of other Kings fince the conquest.*

fol. 9

fol 10. 11:

That which in this parte of the answer, is afterward added of the neceffary reftitution of the right of Ecclefiasticall iurisdiction, to the Crowne is alfo confuted by the fame S. Edward Cocke, who plainly faith, *that though there had been no fuch law of reftitution made, yet it was refolved by all the Iudges, that the Kings and Queenes of Englād for the tyme being, by the auncient prerogative law of England, may make fuch a Commiffion etc. And therfore by the auncient*



ent lawes of this Realme, this kingdome of England is an absolute Empire, and Monarchy, consisting of one head, which is the King, and of a body politike, &c. Also that the Kingly head of this body politike is furnished with plenary power. &c. to render iustice and right, to every part and member of this body. Thus farre S. Edward Cooke. From all which it followeth, that the restitution of the auncient right, howsoever lawfully made (as being made by the whole body of the kingdome) was notwithstanding not necessarily made, as though without it, the King or Queene, for the tyme being, could not haue used their auncient right.

That which followeth in the 2. 3. and 4. branches of this 4. answer to the consequence of this 8 Argument, doth not belong to the matter, because it doth nothing justifie the proceedings of the Bishops or other Ecclesiasticall Iudges, in depriving of the Ministers pleaded for, in such manner and for such causes, as for which they haue depriveded them. The question is not whether jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall by the lawes of the land doth belong (under the King) unto the ordinaryes: nor whether the Ordinaryes in the exercise of the Kings jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall, and Consistoriall trialls, ought to proceed by vertue of Peeres, etc: but whether some Ordinaryes, exercising the Kings Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, haue proceeded in their Ecclesiasticall Consistories, against some Ministers, without authority of the Kings Ecclesiasticall law: & therefore in that respect, contrary to *Magna Charta*, which requyreth nothing to be doone without the Kings law.

Further, although we grant (as S. Edw. Cooke instructeth us) all lawes Ecclesiasticall derived from other (which by De jure Regis Ecclesi. fol. 9 and with a generall consent are approved and allowed here) to be aptly and rightly called the Kings Ecclesiasti-



call Lawes of England: yet I deny that all lawes Ecclesiasticall, derived by the Kings progenitors, either before or since the Conquest from others, are now in this age our Sovereigne Lord *King James* his Ecclesiasticall lawes: and therefore howsoever many judiciall Acts of deprivation, of Bishops & Preists, from their benefices &c. according to the Ecclesiasticall law, which is called *ius Pontificium*, & which was derived, by the Kings Progenitors, from the Bishops of Rome, either before, or since the Conquest, unto *Magna Charta*, and since that, to the 25 of King *Henry* the eyght, were never, all held, to be contrary, but were ever all held, to be agreable to the lawes of this kingdome: yet notwithstanding, I affirme that all Iudiciall Acts and sentences, (how many soever, of deprivation of Ministers, from their benefices) had made and given, by the Ecclesiasticall Iudges, since the 25. of *King Henry* the 8. onely according, or onely by force, and vertue of the sayd *ius Pontificium*, or Bishop of Rome his law, (the sentences given in the time of *Queene Mary* excepted) are, and ought to be holden, not to be had, made & given, by the lawes of this kingdome, or by the Kings Ecclesiasticall law: And why? Even because the whole *ius Pontificium*, or Bishop of Romes law was altogether (excepting the tyme of *Queene Mary*) abrogated, adnulled, and made voyd, by an Act of Parliament; and consequently is but a meere *Alien, Forraine and strange law*, and no municipall law of *England*, and therefore not the Kings Ecclesiasticall law.

Wherefore our Sovereigne Lord *King James*, by this graunt of *Magna Charta* made by his progenitors, beyng obliged, to suffer no Free man of the Realme, to be taken or imprisoncd, or disseissed of his Frrehold, or liberties, &c. Nor to passe upon him nor condemne him, but by law.

25. Hen. 8  
cap. 17



lawfull judgment of his *Peeres*, or by the law of the land. We agayne assume from this statute of the great *Charter*, that sundry sentences of deprivation of Ministers, from their benefices, for causes before specified, are unlawfull; because such Ministers haue been condemned, and judgment hath been passed upon them, without lawfull judgment of their *Peeres*, or law Ecclesiasticall of the land. For heere we must giue the answerer to witt, by these words, (or law of the land,) that all the Kings lawes, of what nature or quality soever, whether Ecclesiasticall or temporall, and not only the lawes temporall, (as he insinuateth) are included. As therefore no temporall Free man of the Realme, may be condemned, passed upon, or disseised of his liberty, and frechold, &c. in a temporall cause, and in a temporall Court, without lawfull judgment of his *Peeres*, or temporall law of the land. Even so likewise, no Ecclesiasticall person, (beyng a freeman of the Realme) may be condemned, passed upon, or disseised of his liberty, or frehold, but by lawfull Ecclesiasticall judgement, according to the law Ecclesiasticall of the land. And heereupon we graunt, if the King haue any law Ecclesiasticall of the land, for the deprivation of a Minister, from his liberty and frehold, for not subscription, perjurie, contempt of *Canonical* (so called *obedience*, omission of Rites, and Ceremonies, not precise observation of the booke of Common prayer &c. Then we graunt, that the Ordinaryes (being the Kings Iudges Ecclesiasticall) may rightly depriue a Minister from his benefice, for these offences.

And yet still we deny, and shall be able to mainteyne, that sundry sentences of deprivation, made and given, by sundry Ordinaryes, against sundry Ministers, be either unjust or unlawfull; or no sentences at all, for the reasons and



causes before specified.

It is therefore erroneously alleadged, that that which was done by jurisdiction *Ecclesiasticall*, when *Magna Charta* was granted, was not at that tyme taken to be done by the King, or by his authority, and that the lawes which *Ecclesiasticall* Iudges practised, were not then held, to be the lawes of the land, or the *Kings* lawes. For the *Kings* progenitors, did both thinke and held, that jurisdiction *Ecclesiasticall* did in right belong unto their Crowne, and therefore in fact, by right of their crownes, did they both exercise, and commaund to be exercised, in their Kingly names, their Kingly right, authority and jurisdiction *Ecclesiasticall* within their Realmes. For how could those Kings, haue commaunded, and how could their subjectes haue obeyed, if the Kings themselves, had thought, and held, that the *Ecclesiasticall* courts, lawes or jurisdiction, were not in right, no more then in fact, at that tyme belonging unto the Crowne as the answerer, vayne, and childishly fancyeth? Which fancy also seemeth sufficiently confuted by the very title of *S. Edward Cooks* booke, *de iure regis Ecclesiastico*. For how could the Kings before and after the Conquest unto *Magna Charta* have been justly intituled to Kingly right of *Ecclesiasticall* jurisdiction, if the Kings had no Kingly *Ecclesiasticall* right, or jurisdiction at all.

G. Powel.

Breifely, the lawfullnes of they deprivation, of the refractory Ministers, is a plaine case adjudged, in open Court, as appeareth in *S. Edward Cookes Report* part 5 in *Cawdries case* according to a Statute of *1. Elizab. cap 2. Sec.*

Reply.

It is a most playne and cleere case, that neither the case of *Cawdrie*, is the case of sundry the late deprived Ministers; nor that the case of sundry the late deprived Ministers, is the case of *Cawdrie*.

Con-



*Cawdrie* was deprived, not by his Ordinarie, but by the *Queenes Ecclesiasticall* high Commisfioners; not for not subscribing to the 3 *Articles*; not for the not use of rites and Ceremonies; not, for the not exact, and precise observation, of the booke of Common prayer: But as well, for that he had preached against, and depraved the said booke, as also for that he refused to celebrate divine service, according to the sayd booke.

S. Edward  
Cook de ju-  
re regis ecc.  
*Cawdries*  
case fol. 3

Agayne, in his cause, it being found before the High Commisfioners, that he had uttered *verba convitiosa* and *contumeliosa*, convitious, and contumelious words, against the booke of Common prayer; the case was not, whether his fact were punishable by the Statute, (for of that no man then doubted;) but whether his depravation, and preaching against the booke of Common prayer, beyng the first offence committed by him against the Statute; he was punishable by tenor of the statute, for the same his first offence, by deprivation, yea or no? Lastly *Cawdries* offence was punishable as well before the *Queenes Iustices* by imprisonment, and losse of one whole yeares profits, of his spirituall promotions, as by deprivation before his Ordinarie. None of all which things, were within the compass, of sundry the late deprived Ministers. For none of the ever preached against the booke, nor depraved the same. They never refused to obserue the same booke, according to the proeme of the booke & tenor of the statute. They were so farr from claymyng any immunitie, from being deprived, for their first offence, as that they stood and yet doe stand, upon their innocencies, not to haue committed any offence at all, against the statute punishable with deprivation, by the statute they alleadge, that they were not punishable before the Kings Iustices by the statute,

looke sent. a  
gainst Caw.



for these facts which they were charged by their Ordinaries to haue committed against the statute, and for which they were deprived. Lastly, some of them were deprived not for any fact done, committed, or perpetrated: but for not promising heereafter, to obserue the whole booke. And what an unconsiderate part therefore is it, to avowe the lawfulness of the deprivation of all the late silenced Ministers, to be a playne case adjudged in open Court; when neither their case, nor any like case to som of theirs, was ever yet brought or argued before the Kings Iustices in any of the Kings open courts at all.

Touching the statut alleadged, 1. *Elizabeth*, it helpeth nowhitt at all the late deprivations of sundry Ministers, First, because such Ministers as haue been deprived onely for not conformyng themselues, to the use of the booke provided by the parishioners cannot truly be charged to haue refused the booke commaunded by the statute. Because the same booke was never provided for them. Secondly, the statute punisheth not every refuser, but wilfull and obstinate refusers. They then that upon conscience onely of Gods word, doe refuse to obserue althings conteyned in the booke, cannot be iustly called obstinate refusers, till their groundes out of the word, be by the word removed. Thirdly, the statute requyreth some Act, done, committed or perpretrated against the Statut: but some Ministers haue been deprived only for not promising &c: as before was sayd. Fourthly, the statute appoynteth the Ordinaries to proceed by inquisition, accusation, or information: But many of us haue been deprived without any of these meanes, and onely npon *Proces*, *Ex officio mero*. Heerby therfore appeareth, how unjustly, and directly contrary to the words of the statute, you insert



## The 3 Argument.

97

sert this Parenthesis, (which they may doe *Ex officio*,) as if they might by vertue of this Statute proceed *Ex officio*, whereas the Statute expressly requyres inquisition, accusation, or information. Is this good interpretation? If you doe so interpret the scripture directly contrary to the wordes of scripture, in the same place you make but mad interpretations.

Touching that which is objected against all hitherto spoken in the poynt of the law, of the opinion of the Judges to be against the same, may it please the reader to remember the saying of an Honorable and most renowned Counsellor in that behalfe, viz. that in such cases and all other, men are not so much to respect what judges speake standing bare headed, as what they say sitting upon the judgment seate, representing the Kings person (yea not *executing the iudgment of man but of the Lord*) when all men stand bare headed before them. 2 chro: 19:6

Concernyng the oth *Ex officio*, we affirme that the law of the land is against the exercise of the same oath, by Ordinaries and other judges Ecclesiasticall. of the othe  
ex officio

The Common law of this kingdome which is grounded upon the law of God, and of reason doth hate and abhorre it. A

First in respect of the frailty of man who for the safitie of his life, libertie, credit, and good name, will not spare to prophane even that which is most holy, and by committing sinfull perjury hazard his soule. which the subtle serpent wel knew in generall though he were deceived in the perticuler, in that he sayd unto God concerning *Iobskinne* for skinne, and whatsoever a man hath will he giue for himselfe and for his life, but stretch out thy hand (saith Sathan) and touch his bones, and his flesh, and see if he will not then blasphememe B

N

pheme



C

pheme thee to thy face. Secondly in respect of the feebleness of the judgment and sentence, that should be grounded upon the othe of such a party, being even then at his convention, aforehand defamed, and of suspected faith or credit.

Bracton

D

Agayne, it is against the common law which constantly holdeth that, *iudicium est in qualibet actione trinus actus trium personarum Iudicis, actoris, et rei. Secundum quod large accipi possunt huiusmodi personae, quod duae sunt ad minus inter quas vertatur contentio et tertia persona ad minus qui iudicet; alioquin non erit iudicium cum ista personae sunt partes principales in iudicio, sine quibus iudicium consistere non potest.*

Britton

E

And the renowned Prince King Edward the first saith by the penn of the learned Iudg Britton, that no judgment may be of fewer, then three persons, that is to say; a Judge, a plaintife, and a defendent, and in case (saith the King) that we be a party, we will that our Court shall be Iudge.

F

Then if the party convented be constrained to accuse himselfe, he susteineth two of the said parties in judgment, viz. *actoris et rei*, which the law hateth, or else the Ordinary or Iudge susteineth two of the sayde partyes in judgment, that is both Iudge and Promoter, which the law doth also abhorre.

G

Therefore true judgment cannot so consist.

H

If it be objected that common brute and fame may lawfully stand in steed of an accuser, and put a person convented to purge himselfe therof, and to deliver his knowledge also of others by oeth; I answer that fame is *tam ficti praeiudicium tenax quam nuncia veri*, and ought to have no credit untill it be presented in course of law or proved, For the law is, that the Iudge himselfe (if he would of his owne knowledge affirme the party to be in famous) is

not



not to be received or beleaved. For that the law will, *quod secundum acta et probata iusticia ministretur.*

That which is often objected, that private relation made unto the Iudge, is sufficient to put the party converted to answer upon his oath, is answered before; for that the parties in judgment must not be fayned persons but such as may stand upright in Court, and answer the party converted his damages and costs if his prosecution be wrongfull, otherwise a man may be greatly wronged, his good name and fame unjustly brought into question, put to great chardges without any recompence and malicious backbiting maintained, and all by coloure of this proceeding which the common law hateth.

That which is objected (that if this course should not be taken by proceeding by oath *Ex officio mere*, vice would abound, for that accusation is dangerous, and odious,) is easily answered. That the commō law seeth this also, and therefore hath ordeyned common enformers to proceed against such as private persons will not deale with by witnessses and such legall courses, and allow them part of the penaltie for their labor, and yet alloweth the party wrongfully accused his damages and costs if the accusation be wrongfull and injurious. In so much as if the enformer will not, or be not able to render it, he shall receaue corporall punishment for his offence, and for the redemption of the defendant credit and reputation.

The Statute law also is, that no fre man shalbe apprehended or imprisoned, or to be displeased of his free hold, or liberties, or free customes, or to be outlawed or exiled, or any wise destroyed, nor we shall passe upon him, nor deale with him, but by lawfull judgment of his peeres or by the law of the land, that is by presentment, Indictmēt,



106

witnes, verdict, voluntary confession, or proceſſ of utlary.

In ſo much as when the Popiſh Clergie would neverleſſe be tampering with this oath *ex officio*, (as their practice was to be meddling for the advancement of Antichriſt in all States) there was a writt of prohibition awarded, as warrented formerly by the Common law; to be directed to the *Sheriff* commaunding him that he ſhall not permit etc: and thereupon an attachment againſt the Biſhop if he diſobey:

2: H: 4: c: 15 After this in the height of the Popes pride in the dayes of King Henrie the 4. (who was willing to pleaſe him being a King in *facto*, but not *de iure*,) this oath crept in, as a *Canoncall ſanction*, by the ſtatute of 2. H. 4.

25 h. 8: c: 14 But the iniquitic, injuſtice; and repugnancy thereof to the Common lawes & ſtatutes of the Realme appearing 23: H: 8: c: 9 to the State, it was by K. H. 8. by the whole Parliament abrogated as injurious to the Crowne, and utterly againſt the common juſtice of the kingdome, and ſo it reſteth condemned to this day. So that no Ordinary can practice it by any power under the Crowne.

25 h. 8: c: 19 Then it followeth that the uſe therof muſt needs be by colour of the Canon law, which being in that poynt derogatory to the Crowne, repugnant to the law of this kingdome, and aboliſhed by Act of Parliament, it conſequently cannot be uſed, but by aſoraine power and the it is *premunire*.

wager of law And to that which is alleaged by the *Civilians*, that the Common law alloweth it in that, which is termed the *wager of law*, or doing of his law, it appeareth that they are therein utterly miſtaken, which may eaſily ariſe out of their ignorance therof.

Fiſt the *wager of law* is voluntary for he that offereth it  
may



may be tried *per patriam* at his election; This is contrary  
viz. *extorted and constrained*.

407

2 The *wager of law* commeth from the certaine knowledge of the deponent, who best knoweth whither he ow the debt or not: This is contrary, most uncertaine, what shalbe demaunded or interrogated

3 Againe, the *wager of law* maketh an end of the strife; but this is contrary viz: the beginning of strife: for it is not finall, but frō thence the Iudge gathereth the ground wherupon to proceed against the party convented.

4 The *wager of law* is in case meere and onely civill, for an honest man may be in debt; but this othe is ministred in case meere criminall, in which case the othe is so much the more odious to the Common law, by how much it is an apparant occasion of perjury: which carnall men will rather fall into, then to subject themselves to corporall punishment, or to lay open their owne turpitude or shāe.

Neither can this proceeding by *othe ex officio* be found in the Honorable Court of Starr chamber. For although the courts of Starr chamber and Chauncery proceed not by Iury, yet they obserue the due forme of justice, and enforce no man to answer, but where he hath a knowne accuser and perfect understanding of the cause or crime objected, and therewithall is permitted to haue a cotype of the bill of complaint or information, and allowed more over both time convenient and counsell learned, well to consider & advise of his oth & answer, and if his adversaries complaint, be either in sufficient in forme, or such as the Court hath no jurisdiction to determine, the defendant upon demurrer without othe is dismissed, and that with costs. And admit the accusation be such as is every way aunswerable, yet if the interrogatoryes ministred be

Starr chamber:



impertinent to the matter of complaint, the defendant without offence to the Court, may refuse to make answer to the same.

Therefore no similitude or likenes between this, oth used in these Honorable courts of Justice & that constrained *oath ex mero officio Iudicis*.

1 Since the former sort be orderly taken in courts of justice, the other without all course of judgement.

2 The one where the plaintiff and matter of complaint are manifest, the other where neither accuser nor matter of accusation doeth appeare, unlesse the bare suspicion of the Iudge, same unproved, or private insinuation, may be allowed for competent persons in judgement, against whom the party defendāt is deprived of all legall exceptions, & is often, after great trouble dismissed and (though innocent) yet dampnified and flandered and without recompence, there being no complanant found, but the Iudge himselfe.

3 The one made upon certaine knowledge and good advisment, the other suddenly without all discretion upon uncertaine demaunds.

4 The one wisely restrained to certaine limits & boūds the other foolishly wandring at the doubtfull will of a fly and subtill opposer.

5 Upon the one the deponent aunswereth to the accusation of his adversarye, by the other he is compelled to be his owne accuser and condemner.

6 The one requyreth an answer to matter in fact done either to the injury of some private person, or hurt of the publicke state, the other constreineth revealing of words, deeds, and thoughts though never offensive to any.

. That which is objected that the saide proceeding is

WAR,



warranted by the *Canon law* or *Civill law*, is answered many wayes; but breifely by the *positive law* it selfe, that banisheth all *Canon Civill*, or other law, or preheminance, or power whatsoever, which is contrary or repugnant to the common law of the land; But this proceeding by the parties owne *oth ex officio mero*, is contrary and repugnant to the common law of the land. *Ergo*

Thus we see that this proceeding by *oth ex officio* was a meere straunger in England, and how it arrived hccerein *Anno 2. H. 4.* but yet as a masker, disguised, marching in the rowte of *Cannonicall sanctions* & obscured from the veiw of the State under that name; but after being discovered as an adder in the grasse, was damned and expelled, by the Statute of 25. H. 8. as a traytor to the King and his lawes, and hath no lawfull or warrantable interteynment by the statute of *primo Elizab*, For that there by no jurisdiction excercised by the Bishop of *Rome* in this kingdome is annexed to the crowne, but that which was then lawfully vsed and excercised within this kingdome:

Conclusion:

Then, for any Ordinary or Iudge Ecclesiasticall to enter-teine it and use it in their courts & proceedings; is a high misprision against the King his Crowne and dignity, and punishable by the Statute of the 16. yeere of K. R. 2.

Now to passe from the *oth ex officio*, to the *Canons*, and of the *Canons* yet not to deale with those that are of indifferent sorte, but with those onely, that are either contrary to Gods word, or repugnant to the lawes of the land, neither also to say all of these in this place, that might be sayd, but on-ly (for brevitie sake) to giue a tast, and to poynt at some; may it please the Christian reader, yea the answerer him- selfe, yea all our adversaries in this cause (that are not too much blinded with mallice) to consider, that all such Ca-



nons generally as pronounce a man *ipso facto excommunicate*, for saying thus or thus, against the *Canons* themselves, against the Ceremonies, against the booke of Common prayer, and the strict observation thereof, etc: cannot be justified in this behalfe by the word of God. For as (to prevent an objection that might be made from the commandement for reading of them publikly in Churches) albeit the sacreed scriptures be dayly publikly read and preached, yet many things are both wittingly and unwillingly spoken, and actually committed, against the sayd sacreed scriptures, for which notwithstanding, such persons are not presently to be held *ipso facto excommunicate*: so certainly (except the authoritie of the Church be greater then the authority of God, and the *Canons* of this last *Synod* more authentically, then the holy scriptures given by inspiration from God,) it must be acknowledged of these *Canons*, and all other constitutions of the Church whatsoever, that every word spoken, or act committed against the (especially unwittingly) is not so heavily to be punished.

1 Tim: 5. 1

Agayne, whereas the sayd *Canons*, doe forbid any man by speech so offending, without publike revocation, of his sayd (pretended) *wicked error, to be restored*: sith the sayd offence may be committed as well privatly, as publikly, and sith the *Canons* speake generally (*whosoever shall affirm etc.*) without any exception of private affirmations; how can the sayd *Canons* in this respect, be warranted by the word of God? If all offences against Gods word, (at least of man against man) be not publikly to be reprehended; much lesse are all affirmations in disgrace of any Ecclesiasticall constitutions of men, to be punished with publike pennance.

Furthermore whereas divers of the sayd *Canons*, doe  
for:



forbid many offenders by such affirmations, to be restored by any other meanes, then onely by the *Archbishop*: sith the layd offence may not onely be unwitting & private, but also by a poore ignorant man, yea perhaps a lame impotent man, dwelling also it may be an hundred myles, or almost 200. myles from the *Archbishop*. What equity is there, that sych an offender, should be debarred from all restoring by any other? And so, for want therof, be deprived (perhaps all his life) from all publike communion with the Church, and from all spirituall comfort for his soule therby? Is this the mercy that is better then sacrifice? And wherby we doe represent our heavenly Father?

The 13. *Canon* commaundeth the celebration of holy dayes, as well as of the Lords day, and that as equally agre yng to *Gods holy will and pleasure*. I deny not, but that as Gods word is to be preached at all tymes, *in season and out of season*, so it is also to be heard as oft as men haue opportunity: but yet that the holy dayes now commaunded to be celebrated, are as equally *according to Gods holy will and pleasure*, as the Lords day (especially so to be celebrated, as they are injoynd, with greater solemnities sometimes then the Lords day it selfe,) this is contrary both to the 4 commaundement, and also to many other Scriptures, which condemne such observation of dayes, and tymes. Gal: 4. 10: Coloss. 2. 16

The holy dayes also now commaunded to be kept, may be abrogated by the Magistrate, as wel as other, that were wont to be observed. But I hope, that although some are bold to say as much of the Lords day, yet our *Prelats* will not publikly allow of any such rash & impious opinion.

The 14. *Canon* commaunding all divine service, prescribed in the booke of common prayer to be read upon the dayes appoynted, *without any diminishyng in regard of*



*preaching or in any other respect*; is agaynst charity and consequently agaynst the word. For the weaknes of some mens body, at all tymes is such, that they are not able to reade all and to preach. At sometime also, the strongest man, may haue such an infirmity, that he may not be able to endure the performāce of both. In winter, many times the extremity of cold, will not permit the whole auditory, to continue so long at Church. Then (will some say,) let preaching by such persons as are so weake, or at such times, be omitted. This indeed is that which many would haue. But this is to ~~performe~~ bare reading before preaching: ignorance before knowledge: and the ordinances of man, before the commaundements of God.

philip. 2. 10.

The 18 *Canon* for bowing at the mention of the name of *Iesus*, is absurd in that respect: because the place whereon it seemeth to be grounded, is not literally so to be understood. First for that it speaketh of things not only *in earth* but also *in heaven, and under the earth*, in which places there are no *knees*. 2. It speaketh not onely of men, but also of all other creatures. For it saith of *all things*. By the literall interpretation therefore, all creatures at the mention of the name of *Iesus*, should bend their *knees*. 3. By this interpretation, no man must sit whilst any thing is read, that hath that name, or else he must rise at the mention thereof to bowe <sup>up</sup> ~~their~~ *knee*. 4. It is superstition, to giue more reverence, to the name *Iesus* then to the name *Christ*, *God*, *Iehovah*, or the *Holy Ghost*. 5. If the *knee* be so to be bowed, at the name of *Iesus*, why not also at the name *Saviour*? For what doeth *Iesus* signifie but *Saviour*? 6. The place speaketh not of that which is due to the name, but of that which is due to the person of *Iesus*. So the *Canonists* are deccaved, with that fallacy, which is *a rebus ad voces*. 7. It  
spea-



speake of that which is due to him, as well in private, as in publike places: in our houses, at our tables, in our beds: as we sit, as we walke, as we ly: If then we sit at table, or ly in our beds etc: we must not speake of *Iesus*, but we must arise to make a legge. Lastly, this name *Iesus*, is no more then *Ioshua*, who therefore is called *Iesus* *Act. 7. 45*. It is also the name of *Iozadak*. *Zeck. 3. 1*: compared with *Ecclesiasticus 49. 12*: and *Ezra 3. 2*: and of the Sonne of *Syrach*: and of one *Iustus* *Coloss. 4. 11*. The common people therefore for want of preaching and by their owne negligence, being so ignorant, that they cannot well discern the name *Iesus* our Saviour from the same name of other, they may mistake themselves and bowe the knee, as well at the mention of other so named as of *Iesus* our Lord and Saviour, and so ignorantly they should commit blasphemy. That which is said for defence heereof by some, that we should the rather bowe at this name, to testifie our hatred against *Arrianisme*, is more dotage then divinity: and therefore not worthy any answer. The Deitie of Christ is more manifest by other names, especially by the name *Emmanuel*, then by the name *Iesus*.

Touching the *Canons* for *Coopes*, *Surplices*, *Crosse*, and other Conformitie, as also touching the present *Hierarchie*, and manner of ordaynyng *Archbishops*, *Bishops*, *Preists*, *Deacons*, etc: and for *Subscription*; it is too long in this place, to set downe perticular reasons against them. Therefore I referre the reader to perticular treatises of those things, both heretofore, and also lately written.

The 49. *Canon*, for no Minister to preach or expound any Scripture or matter of doctrine, without a speciall licence in that behalfe; is a most lamentable contrariety to the word, which commaundeth every Minister, both to



A1A

be *apt to teach*, and *to teach indeede*. And I would gladly know of such *Canon-makers*, whither those that they call by the name of Ministers, be Ministers of the word or not: If they be Ministers of the word, shall they not haue power to expound and preach the word by vertue of the said Ministry? Yea, doe not they themselves, when they ordayne them Ministers, bid them *take power to preach the word*? It is yet more lamentable in the sayde *Canon*, that they commaund all Ministers (not specially licensed, to preach or expound in their owne chardges) *onely to study to read plainely and aptly (without glozing or adding) the Homilies already set forth, or heerafter to be published etc.* For doe not these words plainely import, that some Ministers are not able to read without studyng for it, even after they be made Ministers? Yea, doe not the words (*onely to study to read plainely and aptly the Homilies etc.*) implye a precept against studyng to read the scriptures, which are harder then Homilies: especially against studyng to preach heereafter? O miserable condition then of such people, as haue such Ministers as must goe to schoole to learne to read the Homilies, not the scriptures, yea and which must not study at all euer to Preach.

The 53. *Canon* against confuting of any publike doctrine (how hereticall or dangerous so euer) before the *Bishop* be made acquainted with the said doctrine; is most prejudiciall to the salvation of the hearers of such erroneous teaching. For the soules of men beyng by nature as capable of any errors, as their bodyes are of any infectious disease; and the Bishop of the same Diocesse, sometime perhaps dwelling or beyng an hundred myles from the Church, wherein such errors were delivered; and the life of man being most uncertaine; and Bishops themselves  
be



being sometime erroneous, and therefore not very hastie to haue errors confuted: may not many a soule be infected with such error, yea, and dye in them, before any remedy can be had against them?

This shall suffice for a tast of the contrariety of diuers *Canons*, to Gods word. If I should perticularly runne over other, that haue like cōtrariety; this volume would much exceed, both my owne purpose, and also the likyng of all readers.

Before I proceed to the *Canons* repugnant to the lawes of the land; let me here interlace one reason in a word generally to proue, both the *Canons* and also the booke of *Common prayer* (now imposed upon Ministers,) not yet to be established by law, and so consequently all the proceedings of the Prelats against the said Ministers for not subscribing, observing the booke, conformity etc, to be without law, and against law. This one reason, is from the late Bill of the *Bishops* presented to the *Parliament* for the establishing both of the booke of *Common prayer*, and also of their *Canons*. For if the said booke and *Canons* were already good in law; what needed any new statute to establish them? If they say *that abundans cautela non nocet*, plentifull caution is not hurtfull, they must also remember, that they haue likewise learned, *frustra fit per plura, quod fieri potest per pauciora*: It is in wayne to doe that by many thinges, which may be done by fewe.

Now to the *Canons* repugnant to the law.

*We decree and appoynt* (saith the Synod) *that no iudge, ad quem, shall admitt or allow any his or their appeales* (speaking as they call them of obstinate and factious appellants) *unlesse he haue first scene the originall appeale*. But the King (say I) *is a iudge ad quem*. Ergo, the King (saith this Synod) may



not admitt or allow any appeale etc. The liberty, and franchise then of the Kings will, and grace, after this unwonted manner, ( by a *Synodall* decree onely ) beyng thus blemished, impeched, and restrayned; what dignity, preheminence, superiority, or prerogative, hath the Kings grace, when the King himselfe is charged, not to grant any inhibition out of his Court of *Chancery*, but conditionally and upon an *unlesse* etc.

And if by this *Canon*, the Kings will and grace, receive let, hinderance, and prejudice; what should we thinke, but that this *Canon* also tendeth, to the weakenyng of the Kings arme and power? For how can his power be strong, and his arme able to help, when his grace is bound, and his will, unable to will?

And then agayne, if these two mayne pillars of his Majesties prerogative Royall (namely his grace and his power) be thus shaken by this *Canon*, must it not necessarily follow, that the Lords and Commons in Parliament, are prejudiced therby? For the rights & prerogatives, of the Kings Crowne, by the lawes of the Realme, be not invested, and appropriated, unto the Kings person, onely in regard of his Majesties owne Royall estate; but also for the good condition, and preservation of his body Politicke, which is the Common wealth. Which body also for the just, and necessary defence both of the head (which is the King) and of it selfe, hath such a proper clayme, and interest, in, and to the grace, and power of the head, as the least jote of the power and grace of the head, may not be blemished to the prejudice of the body, without consent of the body. viz: of the Lords & Commons in Parliament, who are the very image, and true representative body of the Realme: yea and thus much in effect, have the Kings  
pro



progenitors, and the Auncestors of our Nobles, and Cōmons agreed upon in Parliament; when by their authority and consent, it was forbidden, that any thing should be attempted, which should tend, to the blemishyng of the Kings prerogatiue, or to the prejudice of his Lords & Commons. And when also, by common consent, it was enacted in effect, that neither King *John*, nor any other King, could bring his Realme and people in thraldome, and subjection, but by consent in Parliament.

Acts & Monuments 4: Ed. 3 pag 422. 424:

Furthermore appeales beyng *de iure naturali*, and introduced into judgement seats, *tam ob defensionem et presidium innocentie, quam ad deprimendam iniquitatem, et corrigendam imperitiam indicis*; as well for the defence and savegard of innocency, as for the depresing of the iniquity, and correcting the unskilfulnes of a Iudge, as they haue been evermore allowed by the lawes, & custōes of the Realme, so haue they been suffered, as freely to be prosecuted, as interposed. For otherwise, how should either innocency be protected, or the injustice of a iudge reformed, in case an appeale being interposed, might not be prosecuted, *frustra* (saith S. Edward Cooke) *expectatur eventus, cuius effectus nullus sequitur.*

de iure Reg Eccles.

And according unto this naturall equity, hath it been specially provided by a Statute of the realme, that the Kings subjects, being greived, should not only haue libertie, to make, but also, to take, haue, use, and prosecute all manner of appeales, after such manner, forme, and condition, as is limited, for appeales, to be had, and prosecuted. And for lacke of Iustice many Courts of the *Archbishops* of this Realme, it is lawfull for the partie greived, to appeale to the Kinges Majestie in his Court of *Chauncery*. And upon every such appeale, a Commission (saith the



Statute) shalbe directed under the great Seale, to such persons, as shalbe named by the Kings Highnes, to heare and definitively determine such appeales, with the causes, and all circumstances. It is therefore apparant, that this *Canon*, is contrary or repugnant to this Statute. For this *Canon*, and this statute thus repugnantly providing, and working divers repugnant effects, the statute simply, admitting the use and prosecution of all manner of appeales, the *Canon* not admittynge but conditionally the use and prosecution of some appeales; can not stand together.

Agayne, some inferiour Ordinaryes having libertie, to take the bridle in their owne teeth, & to lay the reynes loose, on their owne neckes, may in tyme (beyng proudly pampred) wax wanton in their judgement seates; when they shall stand in no awe, of having, the nullitie or iniquity of their proceess and sentences, weyed in the ballance of any superiour Iudge. By reason whereof, this *Canon*, can not but proue exceeding onerous to the subject.

For let a man or woman, dwelling at *Michaels Mount*, be but once judicially, (though perhaps wrongfully) cited by the name of a factious or obstinat person, & cōtemner of ceremonyes, and from such wrongfull citations, let his, or her appeale, made to the Kings Majestie in his Court of *Chauncery* (if it be frō the *Archbishop*,) or unto the *Archbishop* (if it be from the *Diocesan*) be never so just, & equal, there is no remedy in this case, before his, or hers appeale, be admitted or allowed, but the same man or woman (by the letter of this *Canon*) must personally appeare, in the *Archbishops Consistory*, if the appeale be by the *Archbishop*, and if the appeale be to the King in the Kings Court of *Chauncery*, though the same should be at *Barwicke*. Yea, and though the party appellat be never so poore, aged, weake,



weake, and impotent. Nay not only personall appearāce, but personall subscription also, by this *Canon* is requyred, to the Kings Supremacie, to the Articles of Religion, to the booke of Homilies, to the booke of Common prayer, and to the booke of Consecrating *Bishops*, be the party appellat, never so simple a laborer, or never so silly a spīster.

The 37. *Canon* disauthoriseth every Minister by what authority so ever he be admitted, to preach, or to read a Lecture in any place within the Realme, unlesse he be licensed, either by the *Archbishop*, or by the *Bishop* of the *Diocess*, or by one of the two Universities under their hands and seale. Let the King then under his broad seale, graunt licence to any of his Chapleines to preach within his owne chapple, this licenc by this *Canon*, is of no value; then the which what can be more derogatory, to the Sovereaign dignity of the King in causes *Ecclesiasticall*?

Unto the mould of this *Canon*, agreeth the 47. *Canon*, (before mētiōed) which cōcludeth, that no Minister not licēsed a Preacher, under the hand & seale of the *Bishop* of the *Diocess*, or *Archbishop* of the *Province*, or under the seale of one of the Universities, shall take upon him to expound, in his owne cure any scripture, or matter of doctrine, but shall onely study to read playnely, and aptly, without glosing or addyng, the Homilies already set forth, or heerafter to be published by lawfull authority. The King then by this *Canon*, may not licence, a Minister to preach or to expound any scripture, no not in his own cure, no though the ministers Cure, be the Kings owne houshold, or the houshold of the Prince, or any other of the Kings children. Nay by these two *Canons* and the *Canon* of subscription it is evident, that the *Prelats* intended, that every *Scotish* Minister havying renounced the *Hierarchie*, and embraced the single



forme of Government in *Scotland*, should be barred from preaching at any time before the King in *England*, unless he should subscribe to the *Hierarchy of England*. For without a licence may none preach, and without subscription may none be licenced.

And not onely is this 47. *Canon*, derogatorie to the Kings prerogative, but it is also repugnant, to other the Kings lawes and statuts. For whereby that statute, made against *Lolardy*, and *Heresie*, it was enacted, that none should presume to Preach openly, or privily, without the licence of the Diocefan, first requyred & obtayned, yet by the same Act, Curats in their owne Churches, and Parsons privileged were excepted, and by the Provinciall Constitutions, confirmed and ratified by Parliament, it is provided thus: *We establish, that no secular, or regular, not authorised by written law, or protected by speciall priviledg, to preach the word of God, may take upon him the preaching or exercise of the same word, within any Church, or without any Church, unless first he present and submit himselfe, to the examination of the Diocefan etc: But concernyng a perpetuall Curate, we understand such a one, by law and right to be sent to the place, and people of his Cure.* And that we may understand whom the Canon meaneth, to be a perpetuall Curate the gloss sheweth us, that a Bishop in his Dioceff, a Parson and Vicar in his Parish, and every other Person intituled, to any benefice whereunto apperteyneth cure of soules, is to be understood to be a perpetuall Curate, and that he may preach in his owne Cure, without the Bishops licence.

Moreover by the booke of ordering Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons, every one made a Minister, promisseth that he will giue all faithfull diligence alwayes, to minister the doctrine etc: as the Lord hath commanded etc: so that he will  
teach



teach the people committed to his cure and chardg, withall diligence to keepe and obserue the same. But how can a Minister instruct and teach the people committed to his chardge, according to his publicke vowe, if (as it is sayd in this Canon) he shall not take upon him to expound in his owne Cure, any scripture or matter of doctrine at all, but shall onely study to read plainly and aptly, (without glosing or adding) the Homilies etc?

Lastly, the wordes of the Bishops institution are these. *Teque rectorem eiusdem, ac de, et in eadem instituimus canonice, et investimus, cum suis iuribus, et pertinentiis universis, curamque et regimen animarum prochanorum ibidem in Domino committimus per-presentes.* And we (speaking of a Clarke to be instituted into a benefice) Canonically institute thee rector of the same Church, and of, and in the same doe invest thee, withall her rights & appertinances; and by these presents, we in the Lord commit unto thee both the cure and government, of the soules of the Parishioners in that place. The Clarke then instituted into a benefice, by these wordes of the Bishops institution, by the booke of ordering of Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons, and by the Provinciaall Constitutions, having not a private, but a publicke office, of cure and regiment of soules, committed unto him; how can it seeme reasonable, that he should be countermanded by reason of a Provinciaall decree not confirmed by Act of Parliament, not to exerceise the same his publicke office, without a Bishops licence? For what if the Bishops refuse to grant him a licence? Or what if the Bishops and his officers fee, for graunting, writing, & sealyng his licence be greater then the poore Minister is able to disburst, is it reason that his chardg by this meāes should be left uninstructed? Nay is it not, as if a *Sergiant*

Cure & government by law ought to go together in a minister



at law, called to the barr of the Common pleas, by the Kings writ, solemnly created a *Serjant*, and publickly admitted to the same barr, should afterward be forbidden by the cheife Iustice of that Court, to pleade at that barr, without licence otteyned, under his hand and seale? Or is it not, as if a Doctor of *Physicke*, solemnly created in the *Univerfity*, and publickly admitted to practise *artem medicā*, should notwithstanding, without a new faculty from the *Doctor* of the *Chayre* be inhibited, to minister any *Pill*, or *Portion*, to any patient?

a) levit 5. 1  
2 Tim. 4. 2:  
b) 2. Chron.  
18. 7  
Jerem. 27. 9  
& 28:7  
Acts 13. 10.  
Galat. 2: 11

The 53. *Canon*, before also mentioned, viz. *against publicke opposition between preachers*, is not only repugnāt to the doctrine of (a) holy Scripture, & cōtrary to the practis of the (b) *Prophets & Apostles*, but also crosseth the Ministers vow solemnly made at his ordination. Whose promise is that he wilbe ready, with all faithfull diligence, to banish, & driue away, all erroneous, and strang doctrine contrary to Gods word, and to use both publicke, and private motions, and exhortations, as well to the sicke as to the whole within his cure. But upon occasion given, by any false Prophet, publickly broaching false doctrine, in a Ministers chardg, how shall the Minister with all faithfull dilligence drive away the same false doctrine, and publickely teach the truth, if he may not teach, admonish, or exhort his people, without a licence first obtayned from the Bishop of the *Dioceffe*? For what if the Bishop be upon an embassadg in *Denmarke*? Or what if the *Bishop* himself be of the same judgment with the false teacher?

The 91. *Canon* entituled *Parish Clearks to be chosen by the Ministers*, is contrary and regugnant to the customes of the Realme, in many Parishes of the Realme. And in this regard, this *Canon* hath been blowen to peeces, at the barr of  
of



of the Common Pleas, by the opinion of the whole bēch in *Hylarie* terme last: when upon a writt of prohibition, procured by certayne Parishioners, in the Countie of *Hertford*, the Iudges denyed a consultation, to the Minister of the same Parish, who had convented the Parishioners, before the *Ecclesiasticall Iudg*, for gaynsaying his election of the parish clearke; which by vertue of this *Canon*, he had declared in the *Ecclesiasticall Court*, to belong unto himselfe a lone.

The 77. *Canon* entituled, *none to teach schole without licence*, is repugnant to a statute made the first Session of this Parliament in divers poyntse. First the statute permitteth a scholemaster to teach, in any publicke free grāmer schole, without any licence of the Bishop of the Dioceſſ; or Ordinary of the place: but this *Canon* commaundeth, that none teach publicke schole, but such as shalbe licensed by the one; or by the other. Secondly, the statute permitteth any person, in any Noble mans or Noble womans; gentle mans or gētlewomās house, being not recusants, to teach without any licence of etc: but this *Canon*, commaundeth that no man shal teach in privat house, but by licence etc. Thirdly, the statute permitteth not any person to be a scholemaster by any other licence, thē by the *Archbishop Bishop*, or *guardian* of the spiritualties. But this *Canon* permitteth a scholemaster to teach, if he be allowed by an Ordinarie of the place a lone. Which many tymes, and in many places, is neither *Archbishop*, nor *Bishop*, nor *guardian* of the spiritualties.

Lastly, this *Canon* commaundeth, that none teach in publicke schole, or private house, unless he first subscribe, to the first and third articles, mencioned in the 36. *Canon* simply, and to the two first clauses of the second article;



wheras the statute requyreth no manner of subscription at all.

All these things before written considered, we may safely affirme concernyng many of the said late *Canons*, that they be not to be put in execution within the Realme, unless they shall be confirmed by Act of Parliament: yea that we may also truely speake this in generalitie: that eie all the Churcwardens and syde men throughout *England* sworne to present all offences committed against the said *Canons*, must be falsely perjured; or else that there is not one Minister which shall exercise his ministeriall functiō, nor any one man, or woman, which shall usually come to common prayer, and divine service, but they must stand continually at the Ordinaries mercy, for one offence or other. For the thinges commaunded, or forbidden, beyng innumerable, and impossible at all tymes to be kept, into what a servitude these *Canons* haue brought both Ministers and people, and what an excesiue chardg, is layd up on the purse of every person be he bond or be he free, be he yong, or be he old, for citations, Excommunications, absolutions, and dimissions, licences, faculties, and dispē-sations, Who havynge but halfe an eye seeth not? Nay, that many, in many places, haue already borne the Yoke, and felt the burden of these *Canons*, cannot be denied.

Agayne, howsoever at the petition of the Prelats, his Majestie hath been pleased generally to allow, ratifie and cō-firme, the booke of *Canons*, under the broad seale of *England*; yet may no loyall and honest subject heereupon inferre, that his Majestie intended by the generall wordes of his confirmation, to authorize any perticular matter, devised and decreed, by the *Synod*, contrary to the holy scriptures, hurtfull to the rights, prerogatives, and dignities, of his



his Highnes Crowne; repugnant to any lawes, statuts, or customes of the Realme, prejudiciall to his Lords & commons in Parliament, or onerous to his people. The contents then of sondry the late Canons, in as much as the same be contrary to the holy scriptures, tend to the blemishing of the liberty and franchise of the Kings will, grace, & power, be cōtrariant, or regugnant, to the lawes, statuts, and customes of the Realme, be prejudiciall to the Lords, and Commons in Parliament, without whose consent, no new bindyng law, ought to be made, or be such, as may become very onerous to the people; it is a playne case, that every of the Kings liege & faithfull subjects, ought to defend the Kings right, Honor and dignity against all such Canons.

For heerby it seemeth that as all other the wisest and best Princes that ever haue been, haue in some things at some tymes erred, so we without offence (I hope) may say, that the King also *veritate tacita*, or *falsitate expressa*, was unawares somewhat mistaken in his graunt. In regard whereof, such Canons, by the lawes, statuts, and customes of his kingdome be meerely voyd, and of none effect to all constructions & purposes: whereupon also, that necessarily followeth, that the same can receive no beyng, by his Majesties confirmation. *Quod omnino, non est, confirmari non potest.*

## THE 9 ARGUMENT.

God hath promised to recompence the least kindnes shewed to his servants, especially to the Ministers of the Gospell. And the same God is not unrighteous to forget etc: but faithfull, and hath alwayes performed his promise, as appeareth by divers examples. Heb. 6:10 and 10.23  
Ergo: In this regard the High Court of Parliament ought the more to help and releue the Ministers pleaded for, and the peo-



A26

ple depending upon them.

## Marginall notes.

G. Powel a Ministers are to be rewarded as they be such, and in their office: but not as they be Schismatikes, and disturbers of the peace of the Church.

Reply.

There is a secret contradiction in the first parte of this answer. For as a Mayor out of his office is no Mayor, so a Minister out of his ministry is no Minister. See the answerer at large. Secondly, Ministers violently thrust out without just cause, are not to be blamed. Touching disturbance, we say that not we, but the *Prelats* that plead for *humane* and *Romish Ceremonies* (much hurtfull and nothing profitable,) are they that trouble the Church. For the Church would otherwise be quyet inough.

G. Powel b *Arcadian wisdom*. The place Math. 11.11. is to be understood not in regard of the office, but in respect of the cleare knowledg they should haue of Christ, after his resurrection.

Reply.

The first part of this *note* beyng but a scorne I leaue to scornors. The other divinity of this *note*, is very deepe and profound. How shall I sound the bottome of it? Doth Christ speake of *Iohn*, in respect of his knowledge, or of his office? Did the people goe out into the wildernes unto *Iohn*, in respect of his knowledge, or in respect of his office, to be baptised of him? Doth Christ also aske whether the knowledge, or the baptisme, (that is the ministry) of *Iohn* were from heaven or of men? Heerby it is manifest that Christ compareth *Iohn* with the Prophets in respect of office, not in respect of knowledge. Therefore also in the same respect he compareth the least in the kingdom of heaven with him, and preferreth the least Minister of the gospell for his ministryes sake as much before *Iohn*, as he had before preferred *Iohn* before the Prophets.

Math. 3.6.7

Math 21.25

Lastly, the ministry of the gospell is greater then the know.



knowledge of the gospel, because it is both the end for which God giveth more knowledge to some then to other, and also the cause that worketh knowledge in other. If therefore the least in the kingdome of heaven, be greater the *Iohn Baptist* in respect of knowledg, which is the least, then much more is the least minister of the gospel greater then *Iohn Baptist*, in respect of his ministry which is the greater. The note with (c) is not worth a Cee (as they speake at *Oxford*) of single beere.

*Further answer to the 9. Argument.*

He doth any kindnes to a Minister, as he is a minister, shall haue reward. But if a Minister doe otherwise then he ought (as these refractaries doe) what kindnes then ought such to haue?

G. Powel

What a multitude of conformable Ministers are quite overthrowne by this Argument? For doe not many of them otherwise then they ought? Yea, doe not more of them otherwise, then all thes now in question? Is not this so to stand in a gap, as that the gap is troden downe, and a dore opened, for all men to deny all duety to all Ministers? For who doth not otherwise, the he ought to doe?

Reply.

Let the refractary Ministers duetifully serue God and his Church, in their diligent and humble obedience, in the worke of their vocation. Then let them supplicat for kindnes etc.

G. Powel

What is that dilligent and humble obedience etc? To put on a *Surplice*, to make a vanishing *Crosse*, to read *service*, to acknowledge the *Prelats* to haue power to make ordinances against Gods word etc. How shall they supplicat? With an 100. or 200. in a bagge. Then perhaps if they arise betymes, and ryde a pafe, they shall haue a payre of benefices; an *Archdeconry* etc: yea liberty also to goe whither they will, & never to come at any of their benefices, but only in gathering time or if they lie at one of their benefices they shall haue leaue I to suspēd themselves from

Reply.

prea-

Q



428

preaching as long as the list: yea to do what else they will without controullment, so it be not against conformity. Notwithstanding the *Canon* for halfe yeares residence at either of their livinges, they haue many quirkes to a voyd the danger therof.

## THE 10. ARGUMENT:

*The Lord hath forbidden all wrong to any of his servants, especially to Ministers. He threateneth also to revenge the least injury done unto them: and performeth that which he hath threatened. Neither doth he account them onely guiltie of the former fault, that doe his people any hurt, but those also that doe not, help in their need. Ergo The high Court of Parliament, ought to take the present opportunitie for relieving the Ministers molested.*

psal. 105. 15  
exod. 17. 14  
15.  
1. Sam. 15. 3  
Iudg. 5. 23.

The marginall notes of this Argument conteyne nothing but a vayne repetition of matters before noted and answered; they conteyne nothing, but that we are *Schismatiks, false prophets etc: cruell*, in forsaking our charges for litle or nothing etc. I doe therefore dismisse them, with admiration, as of the notaryes barrenes and folly, so also of the virtue of *Crosse and Surplice*. As the *Ephesians* cryed out of their *Diana*, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*; so say I, *great are Crosse and Surplice of the Conformitans*. The use of them, maketh men Gods, Prophets, true prophets, peaceable men, faithfull Ministers: but the refusall of them makes men schismaticall, cruell, superstitious, false prophets etc. Who would not be in loue with them, wherein there is such excellent virtue? How many may more truely sacrifice to them; then some sometyms are sayd to haue sacrificed to their nets?

Aas 19. 28:  
Habba. 1. 16

## Further answer to the 10. Argument.

G. Powel

It is an ungratfull, yea an ungracious parte of these supplicants, to taxe the Honorable assembly, or any Magistrate in this land so undu-  
fully



tifully and unchristiantly, for unjust, cruell and mercilesse dealing.

Who doth so taxe them? Doth every one that admonish other of that which God forbiddeth or threatneth, Reply taxe them whom he doth so admonish of those faultes that are forbidden? Your selfe haue taxed them indeede before, of matters nothing beseemyng you: yea, and the Prelats doe dayly taxe (if not also threaten to excommunicate them) for dealing so much for us: for opposing themselves so much to the Prelacy: for doeing so much as they haue doone against *non residency, the disorders of the high Commission, the abuse of citations, the horrible abuse of the great censure of the Church, Excommunication etc:* yea for dealing at all in the matters of religion: yea, haue they not more stoutly then wisely sent out their *Inhibition* against them in that behalfe? Thus they may doe what they list, Psal: 12 as though *their tongues were their owne*, and there were *no Lord over them*: but we poore men oppressed by them, may not humbly petition to the Parliament, but that we are presently exclaymed of, *as ungratefull and ungracious, & as undutifully and unchristiantly taxeyng them for uniuert, cruell and merciles dealing*. Wherefore doe they thus charge us? Because they feare that we will lay the same thinges to their charge. But though they doe thus esteeme of our petition, yet we hope it is better accepted of the Honorable Courte, unto which it was directed.

Wheras in the rest of the answer to this 10. Argumēt, he sayth the refractary Ministers (as he calleth them) *were never proceeded against for preachyng the gospel, or for opportune & sober executyng their Ministry*, this is utterly untrue, for some haue been molested for preachyng any thinge tendyng against the present *Hierarchy*, or any other corruptions: some also for confuting the Popish doctrine of



other, though they haue doone it never so soberly : and some for other matters, which are poyntes of the gospell as well as other.

### THE II ARGUMENT.

*Pharo in the great Egyptian famine, at his owne cost provided for all his Idolatrous priests, that they might not sell their lands. The Monks, and Fryars in Popery (yet in the twylight of the gospell) at the dissolution of the Abbyes, were provided for, during their life tyme. Ergo, The high Court of Parliament, in this cleare light of the gospell, ought much more to provide that the ministers of the gospell; may not be turned out a begging with their wives and children, as they are; when all other haue their fill.*

### The Marginall Notes.

*G. Powel e VWhere superstition sitteth Iudge, there neyther nature, nor reason may dare to plead the cause. Alas, it is very lamentable, that some men (I know not for what carnall respects) had rather curry fayour with other, and beholding to other men, the conscionably liue, and their owne. They should well consider the saying of the Apost. 1: Tim. 5. 8.*

*Reply.*

In divine matters, neither superstition must sit Iudge, neyther must things be pleaded by nature or reason, but all must be done by the word of God, the store house of divinity. They are, superstitious, that stryue more for re-  
teyning and practising of humane Ceremonies in the worship of God, (be the pretense what it will) then they regard the truth of God. The (answerer as a very pitifull man) cryeth out, *Alas it is lamentable etc.* But one of these poore Ministers, yea many of them by reason of their troubles, may come ten tymes to some of his great Masters houses, and not be offred once to drinke of a cupe; but the truth is, they haue forgotten Apostolicall hospitality, and they haue learned Lordly Episcopall hostility. Further marke here his contradiction, or oblivion. Before in  
his



his consideration of the preface to the Arguments, he hath expressly charged them with divers particular carnall respects, etc. Now he sayth, that *he knoweth not for what* contradictiō  
*carnall respects they curry favour etc.* As for currying of favour; it belongeth rather to some hungry trencher chaplines, then to those against whom he writeth. Yea, as *Shimei* that cursed *David* when his kingdome was somewhat 2 Sam. 16  
doubtfull, yet at his safe returne and reestablishing of the 13  
Crowne unto him, was as forward as any other, by cree 2 Sam. 19  
pyng and crouchyng, by flattering and fawnyng to curry favour agayne with *David*, so it is well if there haue been no such curryers of favor among the Prelats. The place of *Timothy* is abused. It might in like sort haue been applyed to all the Martyrs. We must not provide for our families by doying any thing against Gods word. That we had rather liue of our owne, then of other mens, is manifest in that we doe so earnestly sue to be restored to our places, the rather that we may not be chargable to other. 18

b Alas let them haue pity upon themselves, and leaue their quarrelling, and they shall not be neglected.

G. Powel

This is spoken more like an *Archbishop* that had power Reply.  
to preferre other, then like a young chapline that needed and wayted for preferment himselfe. I know not, who may more justly be charged with quarrelling, then they that beate and buffet their fellow servants: yea then they that *smite Christs Syfter, his loue, his Dore, his undefiled*, yea, not only *smite her*, but also *would her, and take her wayle from her*. We would gladly liue in peace, (with holines) but we cannot be suffered.

*Further answer to the 11. Argument.*

The Argument doth not follow, because of the dissimilitude in the instances, or examples: G. Powel

The Argument doth follow the better, because of the Reply.  
dissimilitude.



similitude of instances (as the answerer speaketh) or rather because it is a *minore ad maius*, from the lesse to the greater. This inequality of examples, rather strenghtneth then weakeneth the Argument and the cause. But let us see his dissimilitudes.

G. Powel i Pharao thought his priests to professe true religion, and diligently to obey him etc: But refractary Ministers, though professing true religion, yet doe obstinately (beyng blynded with superstition) refuse to serue God etc:

Reply.

The obedience of the molested minister to his Majestie: as good as the best Conformitans:

2 Sam: 24

As *Pharao* was in error touchyng the religion & obedience of his Priests, so are our Prelats touching our refractarieness and superstition, as hath been sheewed. Our obedience to his Majestie is as good, as of the best of their syde. That mans obedience to a Mayor of a towne or to any other inferior officer of a Prince, is alwayes the best, that is most agreable to the pleasure of the Prince himselfe. In like manner, that obedience is best unto Princes, that doth best agree with the pleasure of the Prince of Princes, and King of Kings. To obey the inferior without due regard of the superiors pleasure, is but flattery and fawnyng, not good obedience. So to obey Princes, without due regard to our dutie to God. For it is more prejudiciall and hurtfull, then beneficiall or profitable to such Princes. See the words of *Samuell* to the Israelits. 1 Sam. 12. 15. & 25: & the example of *Ioab* in numbring the people by the commaundement of *David*, whereupon followed an exceeding plague.

Touching the serving of God and his Church, in the faithfull and diligent function and exercise of the Ministry; we are unjustly charged to refuse it, for we humbly and earnestly desire it, aboue all maintenance: and for this desire we are thrust out of our livyng.

G. Powel 2 The *Mnks* and *Fryars*, were put out against their wills for Sodomie,



mi, heresie, Idolatry etc: The refractory Ministers are willingly deprived for obstinate superstition, in refusing sincerely to Preach the gospell, not beyng conformable to the Christian lawes of our Church, and Magistrat:

The more justly, that *Monks* and *Fryars* were put out, *Reply.* the stronger is the Argument for us to be provided for, that are put out unjustly: without objection of any such foule crymes to us, as for which they were put out. Yet it is false, that they were put out for heresie or Idolatry; though they were heretikes and Idolaters. For they were suffered still in their heresie & Idolatry, as well after their putting out as before. Neither also are we willingly deprived, any othewise then *Marriners*, willingly throwe their goods over boord into the sea, to save their liues and the ship the better. Of superstition I haue spoken often; this now I ad, that many account carefulnes to keep a good conscience in smale matters as well as in great, to be superstition. And in the meane tyme, themselves care neither for great nor smal matters, any further thē there are lawes of man in that behalfe. As for superstition indeed, we are silenced and deprived because we will not yeeld to humā Ceremonies, that haue been and are superstitiously abused in the worship of God, and of Idols, amongst the Papists, whatsoever they are amongst us. It is also as false, that we refuse to be conformable to Christian lawes.

Acts 27. 38:

*Monks* and *Fryars* could not haue kept their places, by submitting themselves: But these may by conformyng themselves: &c.

G. Powd

I know no condition of submission offered to *Menks* *Reply.* etc: Touching the rest, we thanke you for nothing. This is the curtesie of Prelats, to make us pay decre for our lyvings, even to buye them with sinnyng against God, (as some of them are sayd to doe,) with Symony, and otherwise. But we dare not accept them at the price. The rest

Q<sub>4</sub>

haue



934

haue been often answered. I haue not such leysure, to use *tautologies* as the answerer seemeth to haue had at the writing of his answer, as though he were connyng a lesson by heart, in feare of beating for forgetting the same.

## THE 12. ARGUMENT.

James 5. 6

Apoc. 5:8:

Ezra 6:10

Genes: 20:7

*The prayers of all the godly are much to be esteemed. Especially of the Ministers of the word. Ergo In this behalfe the Ministers now troubled, are the more to be respected.*

## Marginall notes.

G. Powel

**a** True: if they continue diligent in their vocation: But beyng members, rent and cut from the body of the Church of God in this land, they are unserviceable for the same:

Reply.

lib: de Adia-  
phoris:

What man? Haue you unchristened us? Are we now Heathen and infidells agayne? It may be you will say we are worse; yea you haue already called us *Apes*. Before also in a note we haue been secretly compared to *swyne*. But how then doe you call us your brethren? He is certaynly of a strange stocke, that hath Schismatikes, fals prophets, heathens and infidells, *Apes* and *swyne* to his brethren. But it were good that some of the Prelats that made the *Canons* and doe execute the same, did consider, in what danger they are by the statute of *Excommunicingment*, for making and executing *Canons* contrary to former laws, and statuts of this kingdome. Heere agayne behold, the admirable efficacy of conformity, as that wherein consisteth the life of the Church, and wherby men are members, yea Angels of the Church in *England*: & without which, men are not so much as members thereof.

G. Powel

**b** Are they faithfull that fall from their rule of obedience?

Reply.

So long as we keepe our selues to Gods word, we fall not from our rule or obedience. For we acknowledge no other rule or obedience. *Luther* left the rules and obedience



ence of *Monks*: so many other left other rules of Popery. Yet, I hope you will not deny thē to haue been faithfull, or call them schismatikes. As for your rule and obedience of Conformity in some perticulars, many of us haue not fallen from them: First because we never yelded to them. 2 Because to leaue Conformity, is not to fall, that is to goe downward; but to arise, that is to goe upward. *Bitter rootes spring up*, that is, come out of the earth frō beneath. Heb: 12:15 *But the way of life is on high, and every good and perfect gift cometh from above.* Prov. 15: 24 They that haue left conformity, are more James 1. 17. ashamed and greived for having been Conformable, then for leavyng it, though they pay sweetly for it.

## Further answer to the 12. Argument.

1 Neither are the prayers of Schismatiks much to be regarded: 2 Neither will the Honorable court of Parliamēt, altogether neglect the refractary ministers: 3 Neither can the refractary ministers in charity but pray for the high court, yea in case, they did not satisfie their desire: G. Powel

This answer consisteth of 3 parts, according as I haue noted the same. Concernyng the first, it is not much to be denyed if men be schismatikes indeed, and not only in name. ~~Therefore~~ touchyng that and the second, neither the answer nor all the Prelats in the world: shall ever proue us schismatikes and refractaryes, as they unjustly terme us. For the third, albeit the High Court of Parliament would doe nothing in our behalfe, yet we will say with *Samuell*, God forbid that we should sinne against the Lord and cease praying for them. Notwithstanding it cannot be denyed, but that the more justice and kindnes we shall receive from them or by them, either at this Session or at any other heerafter, the more we should be both bound and quickened to pray for them. But the zeale of the Parliament, in doeyng so much all ready for us as they haue doone, is worthy our remēbrance whilst we liue. Though

Reply.

1 Samuell

12:13

Genes: 20:7

Ezra: 6:10



Contradicti  
on or cōtra-  
dictie.

it haue not that successe presently, that we haue desired, yet we know not what it may haue in tyme, upon further consideration thereof by his most excellent Majesty, and by his wise and most Honorable Counsell. No seed groweth presently: yea the best seed lyeth longest in ground (for the most part) before it appeare, especially before it yeeld fruit agayne. That that is doone also, shall be a good evidence for us, and for the equity of our cause, as also against the Prelats, to all posteritie; whatsoever reproches, and other indignities in the meane time we susteyne eyther by their speeches, or by their vnjust writyng (vpon record) against us. But here is further to be noted, the contradiction or at the least the contrariety of this answerer, even in this very part of his answer. For in the first parte therof he sayth, *the prayers of Schismatikes are not much to be regarded*. Where his meaning by comparyng these words with other his termes of *being rent & cut of frō the Church, obstinat, wilfull etc.*: must needes be, that our prayers are of no regard. In the third parte notwithstanding, he sayth that we ought to pray for the Parliament, though they should doe nothing for us accordyng to our desire. Ought we to doe that which is of no regard, of no use, of no benefite, to no purpose? Shall not we giue account of every idle word, much more of every idle prayer? Yea are not the prayers of all obstinat, wilfull, impudent, schismaticall and seditious persons, and of all lyers, and false Prophets (such as he hath often called vs to be) abominatiō to the Lord? How then are we bound to pray for this Parliament, or for any other? Are we bound to doe that that is sinne, and whereof we shall giue an account?

math. 12:23

prov: 15:8

Reply.

2 If they had still made conscience of their duety in their Ministry, their prayers had been much more effectuall.

Behold



Behold what conscience these men make of subscripti- G. Powel  
on, Cross, surplice, conformity, and other perticular obe-  
dience; that make <sup>to make, p. p. etc.</sup> no conscience of preachyng: yea not of  
commyng to their flockes once in a yeare; yea some not  
once in 3. or 4. yeares. Is it not strange also, that surplice  
and cross should ad suchefficacie to prayers? How merry  
then would it be with *England*, if all men in all places,  
were forced to were a red, blue, greene, white, or yellow  
cross, vpon their hats, sleeues, or brests etc? And if every  
man, woman and child might never pray privately, or pub  
likely, but in a surplice? Further I pray God, that such as  
make so light account of our prayers for them, doe not  
by their hard dealyngs with us, force us to cry for help  
from God against them, and then feele the virtue and ef-  
ficacy of our prayers in this behalfe, to their greife. For  
*shall not God aveng his elect, which cry day and night unto him,* Luc: 10:7:  
*yea though he suffer long for them? I tell you he will aveng them*  
*quickly.* Let not this be lightly thought on. In the meane  
tyme also, how vile soever our prayers are in their judge-  
ments; yet let this answerer & all other our greatest adver-  
saries understand, that they are not so in the sense & fee-  
ling of those mercyes, that they doe dayly enjoye, as well  
by our prayers, as by their owne. For our consciences bea-  
ring witnes, our prayers are of faith, and in truth & loue,  
we doubt not, but that the King and whole kingdome,  
yea our greatest adversaries doe dayly fare the better by  
them. And this I feare would too soone appeare, if they  
should or could suspend us from praying, as they haue  
doone from preaching.

## The 13 Argument.

*We must pray the Lord of the harvest, to thrust forth labo- Math: 9:23:  
rers into the harvest. God will not haue men onely to pray, but al- 38:*



so to use other meanes. Ergo The High Court of Parliament, must be the more carefull, to provide what they may, that godly and paynfull Ministers whose labours God hath already blessed, may not by head and sholders, be thrust out of the Church, as they are.

There is but one marginall note upon this Argument, which hath been often answered.

So also hath all his other answer to the said Argument touching the sowyng of the tares of sedition, schisme, faction, and disturbing of the peace. All which doe rather belong to them that teach that a true justifying faith may be lost, that there is no certainty of Salvation, that plead for ignorance and an ignorant Ministry: (the mother of rebellion and treason, and all other finnes against God & man) and other such like things.

#### THE 14. ARGUMENT.

Luc: 9:26

*In the time of persecution, men ought not to be ashamed of the word of Christ, but to confesse and speake for the same. Ergo. They ought much more so to doe in the tyme of peace, in a kingdome, and to a King and State professing the gospell.*

Marginall notes.

G. Powel a  
Reply.

As if that Disciplinary giddines, were Gods word. Though you take your pleasure of us, yet take heed, take heed, you blaspheme not the ordinances of Christ. Such certainly are litle better the mad men, who impute giddines to the Discipline of Christ, commaunded to be kept without spot and unrebukeable untill his appearing. It is no newe thing for them that stands for Gods truth to be accounted mad men, or besides themselves, and in these dayes, Protestants scared out of their wits. But let them that now offend this way, and especially that account Gods ordinances to be giddines, let them (I say) repent and come to

1 Tim: 6:13

2 King 9:11

Acs: 26:24

Luc: 15:17

them



themselves, lest the Lord strike them with a farre worse spirit of giddines then yet they haue, which will not be cast out by any meanes, no, *not by prayer and fasting.*

b Here againe the Supplicants confesse that we professe Christ and G. Powel his word. Why doe they exclaime then?

If you so call it, we do exclaime as we doe, that we may *Reply* professe Christ and his word more sincerely, without any traditions of men in Gods worship. The Churches of *Ephesus*, *Pergamus* and *Thyatira*, professed Christ and his word and had many excellent things in them; yet our Saviour himselfe exclaimeth, and calleth them to reformation of the few things amisse with them. So did *Paule* to the Churches of *Corinth* and *Galatia*.

c Feare and weaknes forsooth, because they will not partake with G. Powel Schismatikes.

Let scoffers and mockers take heede, that *he that dwel- Reply.*  
*leth in the heaven laugh not*: yea that *the Lord haue them not*  
*in derision*: yea least *he laugh at their destruction*, and mocke  
*when their feare commeth etc.* Psal. 2. 4  
Prov. 1: 26

*Further answer to the 14. Argument.*

The argument followeth not: for refractory Ministers are neither G. Powel  
Christ, nor his word, as hath been declared before. *Reply.*

It hath indeed been sayd before: but by whom, when, or where hath it been declared and proved? Which of us hath ever sayde that we are Christ or his word? As the Church is called Christ. 1. Cor. 12. 12. so both the Ministers & all true beleevers are the ~~Ministers~~ *Members* of Christ. Lastly, they that striue against humane Ceremonies in Gods worship, and for the ordinances onely of *Christ Iesus*, doe striue also for Christ and his word.

THE 15. ARGUMENT.

*As the Parliament hath had a godly care of severity, for the better converting of the Papists, so likewise there ought to be the*



*like godly care for their good instruction by such able Ministers, as against whom they may haue no iust exception. Ergo. In this respect the Parliament ought to doe the more; for the liberty of the Ministers suspended etc.*

I defferr the reply to all the marginall notes, to the further answer following.

G. Powel As if there were not able Ministers inough, in both Vniuersities & in other partes of the kingdome (if competent mayntenance might be procured for them) for every Congregation, without the small hand full of schismaticall Ministers.

Reply

Part of this hath been answered before: yet to help the answerers memory (if it be weake) I tell him agayne, that if we had tentymes as many more, as there are, either in the uniuersities, or else where, there would be use of them all. The Lords harvest is great: the day is farr spent: the laborers that are, are some so weake, some such loyterers, and some so unskillfull, that they make no cleane worke, but leaue as much behind them, as they gather and carry before them.

Besides is it a small matter, for the Minister to be acquainted with the people, and the people with the Minister? As likewise for the Minister to affect the people, and the people the Minister? Agayne, are all fit to teach & to governe the people, that are learned and good schollers in the *Vniuersity*? It hath been iustly blamed by learned wryters of our side, that some Papists haue blasphemously called the scriptures *a nose of waxe, & a shipmans hose*. But now would God, it were not so made in open pulpit, by some great schollers, that are accounted great diuines. Yea, it is lamentable, that in some great places (if not in the greatest) men preach of the scriptures; and yet never interpret the scripture wherof they preach: yea that indeed so hammer the scripture, as though it were a peece of mettall, the which they



they might worke or cast: into what forme themselves best liked: who also make the Pulpite a place rather to sheew their owne witt, wherby to win credit and prayse to themselves, (perhaps also to get a Bishopprike in the end) then faithfully to deliver the message of God, wherby to glorifie God, and either to winne soules unto him, or to confirme and further in godlines, those that are already wonne. Lastly, who rather playe with the scripture as if it were some gue gawe, then wisely handle the same.

As for competent maintenance, I remember what one (that hath now turned his coate, and every where almost chafeth at vs like a Cooke, I remember (I say) what he once answered a Bishop being asked, where he would haue sufficient maintenance for preachers in every Congregation: *A good thong* (quoth he) *might be cut out of your hyde.* As also what *Iohn Baptist* sayd unto the people, *He that hath two coates, let him part with him that hath none.* So say I, that for the better mayntenance of the gospell where there were neede; there might be many a good share had out of the surperfluity of those, that maintayne their wiues in sattin and dammaske gowncs, velvet kirtles, cheynes etc: that bring up their children like the children of Noble men, that fat themselves and theirs, and starue the Lords people: and who after their great abundance Preach not so much in 4 yeares, as they did before, in one.

Luc: 3:11

Suppose there were not able Ministers inough for this purpose: G. Powel Haue not the refractory Ministers, then greater reason to joyne with their brethren in preaching the gospell, confuting the Papists etc: then superstitiously to quarrell about cross and surplice, and to forsake their necessary vocation?

Nay. Haue not the Prelats the more raason to suffer

Reply.

R4

vs



442

us still in the worke of the Ministry with them? We are all willing, so farre to joyne with any in preaching the Gospell, as we may doe nothing against the Gospell, to craze the peace of our owne conscience. The answerer often charging us with superstition, cōvinceth them that say that we doe not that which we doe of conscience. For if we be superstitious in not yeelding to crosse, surplice, etc: then are they to us meere matters of cōscience. For superstition is not in words, but hath her seate in the conscience.

## THE 16. ARGUMENT.

Ephes: 2:14  
15:

*As Christ Iesus to make peace betwixt Iewes and Gentils, tooke away the Ceremonies ordayned by God himselfe, because they had been a partition wall betwixt the sayd Iewes & Gentils: and instituted no other in their places: so the Ceremonies & other thinges now in question, having been the meanes of much debate amongst us, wherby the buildyng of the Church hath been greatly hindred, and the enemyes thereof strenghtned, they ought in this respect to be removed. Ergo.*

*The Ministers now molested for the sayd thinges in question, ought to be spoken for and releevd, and that by the Parliament, because none may doe it better.*

## The Marginall Notes.

G. Powel a Hence appeareth what things they be, that the refractaryes are offended with, why then doe they pretend, the gospell of Christ, reconciliation with God etc: *Ad populum phaleras:*

Reply.

Iohn: 4:23:

These things being repugnant to the purity and sincerity of ihe gospell, under which God will not be worshiped in any such Ceremoniall sorte, *but in spirit and truth;* Being also such, as for which the Ministry of the gospell is restrayned (upon the liberty wherof dependeth the salvation of the people and their reconciliation with God) there



There is no cause, why such scoffing and frumping out-cries should be made against us, as here & else where are made. Yea, though the ministry of the gospell, were not for these things restrayned, yet being urged in the worship of God, they are unlawfull: and men standing against them, and in all humility desiring them to be removed by lawfull authority, may well be sayd to stand in Gods cause, and to plead for God.

c O, *Martin* was an modest man.

G. Powel

Thanks be to God, that you haue no other then *Martin* to upbrayd vs with: who was unknowne what he was, and whose writing was never approved by us: and who al so though he jested at some manners of your side, yet never wrote so bitterly as many of you now doe.

Reply

d They will offend, and yet will not be told of it.

G. Powel

You haue not proved us to offend, in those things wherein you impute most offence unto us. If we doe offend, we are more then told of it: yea our punishment is greater then our offence, because it is greater both then the law appoynteth, and also then the punishment of other whose offences are greater.

Reply.

e Heat of contention may carry men further then were expedient. But are the refractaries mylder in this kind? Witnes all their Pamphlets and libels written against us.

G. Powel

The first parte of this note is plentifully justified, not onely by the booke *Scotish Genevating*, by the most scurrilous book of *The picture of a Puritan*, and by the answerers owne booke *De Adiaphoris*, but also by this presēt answer, injoynd and allowed by authority: wherein (for ought I know) there are more rayling, scoffing, and untrue speeches, then are in all the bookes here unjustly termed pamphlets and libells. If any notwithstanding of us doe offend in this kind, they are not iustified by the rest: yet this is

Reply.

S

not



not to be forgotten, that they that be the loosers, and goe away with the blowes, may be the better borne withall, in their words.

G. Powel f A disgracefull terme. But doe they acknowledge themselves non conformitans and schismaticall?

Reply.

If the word conformitan be a disgracefull terme, is ther not disgrace in Conformity and being conformed? For are not these words *Conformed, conformity, and conformitans coniugata*? Why then are we urged to conforme? Eyther therefore you justifie vs in not conforming our selues (for who would disgrace himselfe?) or else you doe ill to say, we call you by a disgracefull name, when we call you conformitans.

G. Powel g Suam scabiem affricant.

Reply.

It needeth no answer. All men know and dayly heare, how they galle us in every sermon, and how litle we deale with them.

G. Powel h A malicious lye. There are fewe or none in the Church of England, so ignorant and so scandalous in the Ministry, as here the suppliant insinuat: and if any such be amongst us, sure I am that (upon complaint and intimation otherwise) they are severely censured and punished for it. Yet I must giue them to understand, that scandalous Ministers for life, are more tolerable in the Church, then such as be factious, Schismaticall, or scandalous for doctrine, and phanaticall conceits. *Plus enim nocent doctrinae scandala, quam morum delicta.*

Reply.

Neither malicious, nor lye. All men, good & bade doe too well knowe, too many both ignorant and scandalous to be in the Ministry. If it might please his most excellēt Majestie, or his most Honorable Councell, to send out Commissions into all Countrys, and to appoynt indifferent Commissioners (neither Bishops nor any other Prelaticall persons, because such are parties, but religious Noble men and gentlemen) to inquire of this matter, the truth would much better appeare to the everlasting

re-



reproch, of all those that doe so justifie the present state of the Ministry. For the rest of the former note, who knoweth not, that one lewd person (how base and abject soever) may, and dayly doth procure & worke more trouble to a good Minister, and doth more easily prevaile to his ejection, then twentie good men (though of never so good credit) yea, then somtymes the whole Parish besids (though never so great) can doe for the good and peace, of the best Minister? That also for a man, not to were a surplice, or make a cross in the ayre (or I cannot tell wher or how) etc: should be lesse tolerable, then many great sinnes expressely forbidden by God himself, is very strang, yea lamentable, yea fearefull to thinke: much more to speake and write: most of all to print, for all the world, yea for all posterity to behold. Especially, that a learned man, a divine and Minister of the word should so thinke, speake, write, and publish. If this be not to preferre the authority of mortall and frayle man, before the authority of the immortall and most mighty God, yea to make the word of God of no authority by traditions which men haue ordeyned, I know not what is. As for false doctrine, or phana-ticall conceits, which of you all, can justly charge us with them, as many conformitans may be with divers poynts of Popery, with toyes in the pulpit (more fit for a stage, then for *Moses chaire*) with foolish allegoryes, and with such pleading for Ceremonies, as that the people are not onely not edified, but also corrupted and infected: yea & the minds of those that are judicious, and haue any tast of goodnes, exceedingly wounded? The like commision, that before I spake of, would sheew the trueth of these things also.

is An impudent and lowd lye.

So

What

G. Powel



What an exclamation and accusation is this, upon the Printers fault, in setting Conformitans for unconformitans. If mallice had not overswayed reason, he might easily haue seen it to be so, by the scope of the author. I haue also seene (and so many other) diuers copyes corrected heerin, with the authors owne hand.

The notes with (k) l) and m) are often answered. The Greeke word of the next note, the Printer for want of Greeke letters, was fayne to omit. For which reason also all the fallacies in the end of every answer, are left out: the rest of the note followeth.

G. Powel

n The tyme of the old Testament beyng expired, Christ abolished the Ceremoniall law, and ordeyned the New Testament: what will they conclude from hence?

Reply

That no Ceremonyes being instituted by God himselfe since the death of Christ whereby the former were abrogated, God is therefore now to be worshipped in spirit & truth; and that no man or Church whatsoever hath power to ordeyne Ceremonyes for the worship of God.

G. Powel

o VVhat? Not any? No Sacraments? No other Ceremonyes?

Reply

Not any. No Sacraments. No other Ceremonyes. For the Sacraments that now are, were ordayned before Christs sufferings, and before the abrogation of the Ceremoniall law upon his Cross. These words *goe teach all Nations, baptising them etc.* doe but ratifie and confirme that which was before instituted: as also make for the communicating of *the word and Sacraments* to the *Gentils*, which before had been peculiar to the *Jewes*. All other things now in the Church for the government thereof, differing from those that were under the law, were ordeyned by Christ (or at least he had given commaundement for them to the Apostles) before his passion, and therefore before the abrogation of the Ceremonyes. For Christ commanded

his

Colos. 2:14:

math. 28:19

Rom. 3:2:

Psal. 147.

19:26



his Apostles to teach onely such things, as he had *commāded them*: and the Holy Ghost was onely *to teach them althings, and to bring althings to their remembrance, which he* (Christ himselfe) *had told them*.

Mat: 28: 20:  
Ioh: 14: 26.

The (p) hath been answered in the marginall note with h) of the 5 Argument.

q False. They are the bonds of society, besides other uses for edificatiō. G. Powel

Then, where there is no Crosse and surplice, there is *Reply.*  
no society; or at the least but loose and weake society. But perhaps he meāeth no Lordly Episcopall society, because no *Ceremony*, no *Bishop*. He may also meāe society betwixt a Minister and his benefice. So some haue found it true. Touching the other uses for edification, we desire to see them.

r If the supplicants request were granted in the Ceremonies, yet would the refractary Ministers be restless still, untill they had altogether brought in their New Discipline: and (peradventure) more restless then, then ever they were before: G. Powel

As the newes of Christ birth at the first troubled all *Jerusalem*, so it troubleth all Papall Prelats to thinke of Christs cōmyng, in the *Discipline* that he hath ordeyned. These wordes, *their Discipline and new Discipline*, are but marginall *Mathematicall* fictions. None of us desire any thing of our owne, but onely the ordinances of Christ Iesus: which cannot be otherwise called newe, then his commandement for *loving one another*, is called a new com- *Reply.*  
mandement. Iohn 13. 34

This Discipline we haue never attempted to bring in, by any unduetifull meanes, but by all humble supplication to the supream authority, to which we acknowledge the establishment thereof to belong. Therefore, that we will be more restless eyther before or after the obteyning thereof then becommeth us, is but his owne imagination, frō



the experience(perhaps) of the restleines of some Prelats, till they be Bishops, and afterward till they come to be *Archbishops*. Yea the also, till they get some further honor, yea till they haue suppressed all those, that they think doe any wayes dislike of such places. If it might please his Majestie and the other States of this Kingdome, but to permit it in some places where it might be most conveniently, it should much more clearely appeare, both how we would content our selues with all humble thanks to his Majestie and to the other States in that behalte: and also how much better this would agree with all Civill Magistracy, then their present Hierarchicall and Ecclesiasticall goverment doth: yea how farre more beneficiall it would be to the Common wealth: and finally how untrue many other imputations are, whereby it is commonly disgraced. If any should abuse the same, or himselfe in the execution therof, we never denyed, but that such offenders should be subject to the censure of his Majestie, or of any his inferior officers.

G. Powel

Sound and solid peace, will never be wrought, but by recalling the refractory Ministers from Schisme and faction unto perfect obedience.

Reply.

You must first proue us to be in a schisme and faction. In the meane time, sound and solid peace would a thousand tymes better be made by removing all humane Ceremonies, by a more free preaching of the *gospell of peace*. If all Ministers should conforme themselves, yet if the go spell should be sincerely preached, (though never any word should be spoken against the Ceremonies, and other thinges in controversie particularly) certeynly, the Ceremonies and other matters now in question, would be as odious, and in as great disgrace as now they are. It is therefore a vayne thing to labor for peace, without removing



ving of those things. Touching obedience it can never be perfect to man, where it is not found towards God. The establishing of Gods ordinances, will teach & worke perfect obedience unto men, to whom obedience is due.

*Further answer to the 16. Argument.*

1 If the question be but subscription, cross etc: wherefore then, haue G. Powel they maynly cryed out, that it was the cause of God etc:

All this is often answered. The least transgression of Gods word, and the least obedience to Gods word, is the cause of God, as well as the greatest. I wonder the answerer was not ashamed, so often to repeate the same things.

2 VVe hold not Subscription, Ceremonyes, etc. absolutely necessary to salvation, nor to be imposed upon every Church (for why should not other Churches use their liberty?) Yea our Church hath power to alter these particulars, yet we know some ordinances necessary for gathering assemblyes, establishing of a Church, and be as it were bonds and links of society.

How doth the first poynt of this answer agree with that that some of the great Prelats hold, that their authority is *Apostolicall*, and the Ceremonyes *matters of order and decency*? Are not thinges *Apostolicall* and decent, common to all Churches? Or may our Church, alter that that is *Apostolicall*? Or why should these ceremonyes, be more necessary for our Church, then for other Churches? Or not decent for other Churches, and yet decent for ours? If also Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, be invested into the crowne, except the King and with him the officers of the crowne, be only the Church; our Church hath no power to alter them, having no *Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction* resident in it selfe. The latter part of this answer is needles, our assemblyes beyng already gathered. What a foolish & gross absurditie also is it, to insinuate that an invisible cross, or a smockish surplice, should be of any effecacy for gathering of assemblyes?



G. Powel 3 Yea these particulars, Subscription, Ceremonies etc, being imposed by the Church and commaunded by the Magistrate, are necessary to be observed under payne of sinne, seeing he that resisteth authority, resisteth the ordinance of God.

Reply What if they be commanded onely by the Christian Magistrate, not imposed by the Church? Or imposed by the Church onely, the Magistrate beyng an infidell, or a persecuter of the Church? Can payne of sinne also be without payne of damnation? Are not those things that are to be obeyed, under payne of damnation, necessary to salvation? Hence also it followeth, that things once commaunded by the Church or Magistrate (especially by both) are as holy, as the immediate commandements of God. The particular inconveniences and absurdities heereof are infinit. What also is heere sayd, that was not wont to be sayd by the Papists against the Martyrs?

G. Powel 4 That they are things indifferent etc. and may be used without sinne we haue proved in a booke *De Adiaphoribus*.

Reply.

Alas M. Powell, make not such account of your booke *De Adiaphoribus*, then which, there never came more simple stuffe from any man reputed learned. You had neede to recant your blasphemous poynt therein, against the authority of Christ Iesus for making lawes in his Church. Uerily you might as well haue denyed him to be a King, and a redeemer. To the 5 part of this answer unto this 16. Argument, reply hath often been made. That thes things are become bones of contention, is onely the fault of the Prelats, that strive with might and maine for them. They acknowledge that they haue power to alter and remoue them, and the see great reason so to doe: neither can they giue any reasons but childish for continuance of them, and yet to the great dishonor of God, and to the greefe of thousands of the godly, they reteyne them. For our parte



parts, if we were not troubled for them, we would be so farre from contending about them, that we would never aske after them, neither would we care if we never saw them.

## THE 17. ARGUMENT.

God hath lately visited us with a fearefull pestilence, which yet is not ceased: and the end of all his chastisements is, to make us all the better by them. Yea to make us more Zealous: which if we doe not, he threateneth worse thinges unto us. God hath also lately mightely delivered us, from the greatest danger, that ever any people were in: to this end also that we might prayse him the more: and that all Estates may more seriously consult and deliberate, what to giue unto the Lord for all his benefites. And this is the more to be considered, because the Lord tooke the unthankfulness of Hezekia in a small matter for his health, very unkindly. This our former deliverance also was the greater, because it was wrought without the meanes of our prayers. Ergo

Psal. 94:12:  
Heb. 12:19.  
Revel: 3:19  
Levi: 26:18  
Iohn 5: 14:  
Psal: 193:  
Psa: 116:12  
2 Chron: 32  
25:

The High Court of Parliament, ought to be the more Zealous for the gospell etc: the rather now, because they know not (at least many of them) whither ever they shall haue the like opportunitie agayne or no. Yea that so also, their thankfulness may be as publik and renowned, as our deliverance: Yea, their zeale must be the more against all Popery (in respect of our danger by the Papist) for the rooting out of every stump thereof, that their soules may haue the more comfort, especially in death: and that their memory may be the more honorable, with all posterity.

This is the generall substance of the 17. Argument, though amplified by many perticular places, examples of scripture. Now let us see what is sayd against the same, in the notes, and in the Further answer.

## Marginall notes.

a The mistake the ends, as those Gentiles did, who affirmed they were

G. Powel

T

were



were plagued, because of the Christians contempt of their Gods.

Reply.

Nay, you haue forgotten your Logike, in mistaking the end for the efficient cause. The *Gentils* did not affirme themselves plagued, to the end the Christians might con-temne their Gods, but because they thought they had condemned their Gods. This error is in all the answer following. For the author tooke not upon him, to particularize the finnes for which God had visited the land, but onely to shew what the Lord looked for from us, both by his works of Iustice, and also by his workes of mercy and goodnes amongst us. Therefore the notary and answerer in all that followeth, sitteth besides the cushion. Agayne, what doth this note else import, but a soothing up of themselves and of all other in their finnes, that they may not enter into perticular examination and judging of themselves? When as euery man, and every state should particularly censure and judge himselfe and his finnes, to haue had a stroke in provoking the wrath of God so against us. And therefore happy had it been for the Prelats, if they had smitten themselves upon the breasts, for their hard dealing with the Church, in restraynyng the Lords servants, that would haue given every oue in the Lords household, his portion in due season. So happy also were it, if every other state and person, would doe the like touching their perticular finnes.

The second note with (b) is nothing: because the schisme is not yet proved against us. Though we deny not, but that for our finnes, the Lord hath visited this land as well as for the finnes of other, yet not for any schisme of ours. The like I say for the like cause, of the note with (c) And though it behoveth the Parliament, especially, to consider of the workes of God, (as representing the body of

f  
b  
b  
ri  
m  
f  
sch  
Lo  
ga  
Th  
ses,  
mer  
furt  
plea  
out



of the land, ) yet I wish all other likewise to consider of the same.

a I will not descant of the Suppliants meanyng, in alleaging this G. Powel example. The wise may consider it.

So the wise may consider, how foolish malice is, for want of matter from words, to wrangle with a mans meaning, The example is good and holy. The *Bee* will gather hony, out of a stinkyng weede: but the *Spyder* sucketh deadly poyson, out of the fayrest and sweetest flower. The flatterer careth not what he say against one, so that he may please another.

e To wit by setting the state thereof, against hereticall Papists, and G. Powel schismaticall refractaries.

I grant this; it beyng understood of such schismaticall refractaries, as in part rent themselues, both from the Apostolicall doctrine, and also from the auncient Apostolicall Churches, as likewise frō all other Churches thoroughly in doctrine reformed: and so stand in *medio*, betwixt such Churches, and the Romish Synagogues. Who also beyng admonished thereof, in duetifull manner by their brethren; yea by some speciall works of Gods loving severity, doe persist in their sayd schisme, in a most refractory manner.

f As if no good could come unto the Church, but the restitution of G. Powel schismaticall Ministers, which is indeed no good.

Let the reader be pleased to see, whereupon this note is gathered, and he shall see, that there is no ground therof. The author onely asketh a question upon former promises, whether such and such thinges considered, the Parliament would dissolue their meeting without doeyng any further matter in that behalfe (that is for the Ministers pleaded for) then they had donne. He doth not say, without doeyng any good, but any further matter, insinuating



Sophistry.

thereby, that they had done something already: agayne he speaketh not of all causes, but only sayth, *in that behalfe*. But this is the answerers sophistry, often detected. Howsoever he say no good hath been done by Ministers who he calleth refractary, yet thousands that feare God can testifie, that the Church hath received more good by such Ministers, then ever it hath or will by any Papall Prelats, careles Non-residents, trencher chaplins and idle bel-lyes, *that seeke their owne, and not the thinges that are Iesus Christs*, and who are noted, in all publike meetings for reformation of abuses, more to hinder then to further all good motions against the Papists, against swearing, & for the religious observation of the Saboths etc, then common Christians, at the least then those, that they doe contemptuously call laye persons.

G. Powel

g What godlines is there, in wilfull and malicious confronting the Magistrat, in repinyng at their brethren, and superstitious for sakinge their callings, flockes and all to the yndoing of themselves, their wiues children, and frends?

R. ply.

None at all. But who doe more comfront the Magistrat in all kingdomes, then Papall Prelats, that hold their owne jurisdiction to be *iure divino* by Gods law, and that therefore deny all *Ecclesiasticall iurisdiction* to be absolutly invested into the crowne of those kingdomes where they liue, that take upon them to deale without law, besides law, and directly contrary to law, and that many wayes oppresse the Magistrats subjects at their pleasure? As for us, I haue sayd before, I say agayne, and it is published to all the world in the booke intituled, *A protestation of the Kings Supremacy*, that we are so farr from confronting the Magistrat, that we attribute much more unto him, then all the Prelats doe. Touching repinyng at brethren, I know none guiltie heerof, except wishing that Christ Ie-  
sus



hus may haue his owne, the Church her owne, the Magistrate his owne, the Ministers of Christ, and the subjects of the Magistrat their owne, yea every *Byrd* to haue her owne feathers, I know none (I say) to repine, except wishing of these things, and that every mortall man would content himselfe with his owne, be to repine. The rest of this note hath been answered.

**h** A calumnieous censure.

G. Powel

What? To say that vnworthy persons are thrust out into some of their places that are deprived? A man need not to ascend into an high mountaine, or to ryde many myles out of *London* for prooffe therof.

Reply

The next note with (*b*) after (*b*) and before (*a*), (as though the Notary had forgotten his alphabet) is often answered. The next note also with (*a*) after (*b*) is not worthy of answer.

**I** VVe must wisely distinguish between such things as are proper to the Papicy, and what they haue by vsurpation, but are proper to the true Church of God.

G. Powel

Are *Coapes*, *Surplices* and *Crosse* etc: proper to the true Church of God? If they be not, why is this noted upon the authors petition in this Argument, for removing of Popish ornaments? If they be, then either it is no Church, or an imperfect Church, that wanteth them.

Reply.

**m** Proper thereunto.

G. Powel

Are no appurtinances of *Romish* religion to be hated, but such as are proper thereunto? This is wonderfull. For what appurtinances are there of *Romish* religion, which agree not either with *Judaisme*, or *Paganisme*? We are therefore to abhorre whatsoever appurtinance of *Romish* religion, whereof there is no necessary use in the service of God, and which were better abolished, then reteyned. Thus much to the marginall notes, of this 17 Argument.

Reply.



456

In the rest of the answer he dealeth deceitfully, racking divers particular examples, applyed by the author, only for amplyfication and illustration of this generall Argument, or of some perticular branch thereof, racking (I say) such perticular examples, and applying them to the maine conclusion and petition, as intended by the author for a severall Argument to confirme the same. Whereas in like manner, he might haue done the like with divers other particulars in this generall Argument comprehended. But let us see what he sayth.

*Further answer to the 17. Argument.*

G. Powel

In this Argument the Suppliants doe certeynly very worthily & christianly discourse, as of sundry other things, so especially concerning the Lords great mercyes etc.

Reply.

In these words, let the contrariety of the answerer, to almost in his whole answer written, be observed. For he being a scholler, his words must be schollerly interpreted. Because therefore we are not to doubt, but that the answerer remembreth, as well what he hath learned in the *Ethicks*, as in the *Elenchs* of *Aristotle*, may it please the reader to vnderstand, or (rather) to remember, that *Aristotle* in his sayd *Ethicks*, maketh great difference, betwixt *bonum* & *bene*, good and well: *iustum* and *iuste*, that which is iust, and justly. For he teacheth, that good & just things may be done, by evill and unjust men, which haue not the habit eyther generally of goodnes, or perticularly of Iustice: but he sayth, that only good and just men, which haue the habit of goodnes and justice, can doe things *well and iustly*. And this distinction is agreable to holy writ. For *Herod* is saide to haue done many thinges; viz. that were in themselves good: the like may be sayd of *Sauile* and divers other. But certaine it is, that evil men can doe any good or just thig,  
well

Marc. 6: 20:



*well and iustly.* This commeth onely from the spirit of regeneration, and from a true faith wrought thereby, *without which it is impossible to please God.* For as much therfore, Heb: 11:6. as this answerer doth here testifie generally of the Suppliants, that they doe *discourse* in this Argument not onely of many worthy and Christian poyntes, but also *worthily, and Christianly, yea very worthily and Christianly:* yea also for as much as he setteth this downe for a certeynty, saying *certeynly,* how doth this, or can this agre, with all the reprochfull termes before given by him unto them, of *Schismatiks Refractaries, wilfull contenders with the Magistrate, presumptuous censurers, wilfull and malicious confronters of the Magistrate, boasters, lyars, impudent, blind and ignorant persons, false Prophets, fowers of sedition, disturbers of the Church etc?* For can it be sayd of such men, and that for a certeynty, that they *discourse very worthily and Christianly of sundry things?* Let it not be sayd, that *to discourse,* is but a matter of wordes. For their is the same reason of words and works. No man can say well and rightly that *Iesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.* Though an evill man therfore may speake many good and Christian things, yet onely good men, speake good and Christian things, *well and christianly.*

contrarie

Doth God plague us, because of the proceedings against the refractary Ministers? And not rather for our horrible sinnes of security, pride, unthankfulnes etc: This is certeyne: and the rest unproved: G. Powel

I haue told you, of your mistaking your Logike before. The author disputeth not perticularly of the sinnes that moved the Lord to visite vs etc: but of the generall end wherfore he did both correct us, *but* also magnifie his mercy towards us. The which he applied to the particular poynt of favor for the Ministers molested. Notwithstanding, to answer your question, though it cannot be denyed, that for other sinnes the Lord hath so heavily

Reply



Mat. 10: 4.  
15:

1 Cor. 11.  
31

2 Chron: 36  
16:

Mat: 21. 35:  
23: 37:

scourged us, yet why should the suppressing of the Ministry of the gospell be ~~concluded~~? Was, not to receive and heare the Disciples of our Saviour, which were sent out by two & two but for a time to prepare men for the gospell, so great a sinne, that our Saviour pronounceth, that it should be easier for Sodom and Gonorrha in the day of iudgement then for such a City, as should not so receyue and heare his Disciples, and shall the silencyng, and depriving of so many Ministers setled in perticular Congregations, and all ready blessed in their labors, be accounted no sinne? Yea not onely the silencyng of them etc: but also, providyng that they shall haue no other meanes whereby to maynteyne themselves, their wiues and children? God open your eyes to see, and moue your hearts so to cōsider hereof, that yee may not flatter your selues, but see your sinne herein. <sup>and special</sup> Yea, because your selfe speake of unthankfulness, as one speciall sinne provokynge Gods indignation, what greater unthankfullnes can there be, then so to intreate his servants, whom he hath so graced and blessed? *Iudge your selues yee Reverend Fathers* (that are principall actors in this matter) *that yee may not be iudged of the Lord.* Take heed (I humbly beseech you, in the feare of God) take heed (I say) in time, least fire breake forth frō the Lord, and there be none to quench the same. In the destruction of Ierusalem by Nebuchadnetzer, and the carying of the people away captiue to Babel: and in the last desolation of the same City by the Romans, the like misusing of the Lords Prophets is set downe as one principall cause therof. And who I beseech you, in such misusage of the Lords messengers, had alwayes a principall hand? Had not the Priests of the Lord, that should haue done the contrary? Serch the scriptures, and see if they bare not witnes in this behalfe.

If



If God once set things in order before you, shall it be sufficient Psal: 50. 12: to pleade, that the Ministers of his word, against whom yee haue so proceeded, were *Schismatickes, refractaries etc.* Alas, alas this wilbe but a weake plea. Yee haue herd before, that the Prophets were so termed.

Lastly, concerning the particular finnes by you mentioned and other the like, from whence doe they more proceede, then frō the restraint of the word, by the Preaching wherof, they would be eyther repressed or restrayned? If the libertie and free passage of the gospell, worke an holy feare, humility, and duetifull thankfulness, yea, if the preaching of the word, doe restrayne the most wicked and reprobate themselves, that they bite in their lips, hold their hands, and refrayne from many finnes, which otherwise they would commit, (as it cannot be denyed) doe not security, pride, unthankfulness, & ~~all other~~ <sup>all other</sup> finnes come from the restraint of the word?

The answer to the Second supposed Argument, in this 17 conteyned, hath in part been answered before, because it hath been proved, that we are no Schismaticall Ministers. Touching the rest of the sayd answer, we deny not but that there are other meanes wherby that Honorable Court, may testifie their thankfulness, yet this hindreth not, but that this may also be one: yea if it be granted that there are other, then by vertue of relation, this also must be granted to be one. Yea, if mercy to the soule, be more then mercy to the body (as the soule is better then the body: and the misery of the soule greater then of the body; and cruelty to the soule worse then to the body) then it followeth that this is a speciall & principall meanes, wherby to testifie their thankfulness.

His answer to the third supposed argument in the 17



Argument hath also been answered. The same I say of his answer to the 5. supposed argument. Onely therein the answerers censure of the Parliament if they should restore us, is to be observed, viz. that *they shall not onely attract guilt and remorse of Conscience, but also preiudice their Honorable age, and make their names reprochfull to all posterity.* This toucheth not only the Lords of the upper house, and body of the Commons in the Netherhouse, but also his most excellent Majestie, without whose Princely authoritie nothing can be done by the other. Let all Prelats that pleade more stoutly for superstitious Romish raggs, then they doe duly regard Gods holy ordinances, let such Prelats rather take heede, that such things as are here threatened to the Parliament by the answerer, doe not be fall unto them.

Whereas the answerer, in his answer to the 14. supposed Argument betwixt the third and the fifth, reckoneth us up (in the bitternes of his spirit) with all Schismatikes, Heretikes, Papists, Athists, murtherers, theues, cutpurses, etc: therein he sheeweth his brotherly loue and kindnes towards us, and how well he spareth us. But sith *Christ Iesus was counted among the wicked; yea crucified betwixt two theeves.* yea, and had also a murderer preferred before him; why should we his servants, wretched men, and great sinners be greeved or ashamed, thus to be reckoned with such vile persons? Yea rather we may the more comfort our selues, because *if we suffer with him, we are the better assured that we shall reigne with him,* who hath prayed the Father, *that we may be with him, even where he is, to behold his glory.*

2 Tim 2. 12  
Iohn 17. 24  
G. Powel  
Iudges 4. 2:

The instance of Iael is altogether different, For *Sisera* was a speciall enemy of the children of Israel, and Church of God, but the ornaments the Supplicants speake of, are the good creatures of God, having no hurt at all in them.

Was



Was not *Sisera* also the creature of God, and in that respect may it not be sayd, that he had no evill in him? And is not the Pope also an enemy to the people and Church of God, as well as *Sysera* was? Yea is he not much more, in as much as he is enemy to their spirituall state, and everlasting salvation? Moreover, touching the ornaments of Popery mentioned in the Argument, doe we speake of them as they were the creatures of God, or as they were and are still by many Papists abused to Idolatry? What doth the answerer say for them, that might not haue been sayd *for the covering of the images of silver*, which the *Jewes* (that should truly repent of Idolatry) were to pollute, that is to account as thinges polluted; and for the rich ornaments of the images of gold, which also they were to cast away as a menstrous cloth, and (with great disdain) to say unto it, *get thee hence*. What fallacy this is, the answerer knoweth.

Reply. 461

Isa. 30: 22

Sophistry.

Neyther were the Popish Priests ever decked with our ornámets, neither are they now. Neither, were our ornaments ever worshipped, or abused to Idolatry, eyther are they yet. Neyther, if they had been, is it absolutly necessary to destroy the substance of them etc, but only to take away the abuse, and to restore the right use. The reasons are sheewed chap 11 *De adiaphoris*.

G. Powel

Are you sure, their is never a *Surplice* now in England, that was abused to Idolatry publikely in *Queene Maryes* time, or secretly sithens that tyme? If it be true of surplices, are you sure it is true of all *Coapes*? Nay rather, I scarce thinke, that there is not any *Coape* now, that was not in the time of Popery. Besides, haue you forgotten the distinction of *idem specie*, and *idem numero*? *Ahas* sent not the same Alter to *Ierusalem*, that was at *Damascus*, but onely commanded the like thereof to be made. By this reason also we may erect new images in Churches, (as some all

Reply

2 Kings 16: 10:



xceter

462

Sophistry.

Deut 12.31

ready are in some places) and say that these images were never worshipped or abused. Here therefore behold againe your sophistry. Touchyng the substance of things abused to Idolatry, we urge not the destroying thereof, neyther doe we deny the restoring of them to any good civill, or naturall use from which they were first taken and implo-  
~~ved~~ yed to Idolatry. But we deny that ~~we~~ ought to haue any such honorable use, as to haue any place in the service of God, who expressly forbiddeth to be so worshipped. I understand this of such thinges as God hath not commanded, or wherof there is no necessary use. Such are the ornaments in question. The objections against this are plentifully answered in other books. The 11. chapter of your booke wherunto you referre us, is not worth the reading of a learned man. It conteyneth objections of your owne making not of ours. Which of us, was ever so mad, as to say, *que ad Dei gloriam fiunt, iis colitur Deus*. For are not the duties of the second table performed for the glory of God? Is God worshipped by them? This is to confound both the tables. Who ever also saide, *Quicquid fit ex fide et Deo placet, whatsoever is done of faith, and pleaseth God, is the worship of God*. So our eating, drinking, and whatsoever else we doe, shall be the worship of God. I wonder you blushed not to impute such thinges unto us, and to cast your owne shame upon us.

The third objection indeede in that chapter, touching the proposition, is in part (yet not wholly) ours. But your answer thereunto maketh more for us then against us, as a child that hath well learned the principles of religion might easily shew. But I for beare answer of them, and leaue them to other to shew your childish weaknes therein, and in that whole booke. By the sight wherof I praye  
 God



God you may see, what it is to write against the truth. In other things you haue written well, and we thanke God for your paynes: but in these causes your arguments are like fagots of thornes full of prickes without substance, bound with bonds of strawe, which by the fire of Gods truth, are quickly burnt up, though for a time they fill a great roome, and seeme to make a great blaze: yea they are like to *ignis fatuus*, which terrifieth simple men, as if it were a spirit, but is in truth, but a litle fire of certeyne fly-mie exhalations: at the most they are but like a Comet or blazing starr, which though it seeme to ignorant men, to be aboue in the starrie heavens, with the fixed starres, yet for all that is but in the highest region of the ayre, and at the last is dissolved into winds.

Thus much for reply to the 17. Argument: yea to all. For to the conclusion of all (which the Notary & answerer unaptly call a distinct Argument) their is nothing answered requyring any further reply, then hath been already made. This therefore shall suffice, for defence of the former Arguments. In the answer whereof, though (perhaps) there be the more scoffes, reproches, cavils, bitter speeches, and uncharitable collections, to haue provoked us unto the like, that thereby some further advantage might haue been ministred unto them, against our cause and against our selues: yet as the author of the argumēt, used not any such word to provoke them, so I thought good to walke in the like steppes of modestie, that the defence of the Arguments might be the more suitable to the Arguments themselves: that the author of them might haue no cause justly to blame me, for disgracing his work and the cause it selfe by a contrary course: and that the mindes of the Prelats may rather be mollified towards vs.



464  
then any thing more exasperated against us. If it fall out otherwise, and that our mildnes doe still increase their rigor, God (I hope) shall giue us patience, to indure whatsoever he shall suffer them to doe unto us: together also with such comfort, as all the world shall not be able to take away from us. For we are so thoroughly perswaded, from the evidence of Gods truth, revealed in his word: and sealed up in our hearts by his spirit, the cause wherein we stand, to be the cause of *Christ Iesus*, that we say with

Acts 21.13: *Paule, we are ready, not to be bound onely, (neither onely to loose our livings) but also (herein) to dye for the name of the Lord Iesus.* I speake not this seditiously (and therefore let no man so wrest my words) but I speake, with that mind, and in that manner, that *Paule* spake the former words, to signifie our readines, for suffering any thing, which the Prelats shall do unto us: not for doying any thing to resist them. Some of the harpe much vpon this string, (as appeareth by wresting of our words in most malicious manner in the former answer against us) yea, they seeme also to thinke long, for some law or other of this land to be wrested against us, to make some of us examples unto other, by sheading of our blood; but if they should so fare prevaile (which I hope they shall never doe, in the dayes of gracious and mercifull *King Iames*, nor in the dayes of any of his most Royall blood) let them remember the words of *Jeremy* in the like case, to the Priests and Prophets that sought his blood, *As for me, be hold I am in your hands, doe with me as you thinke good and right. But know you for certeyne, that if ye put me to death, ye shall surely bring innocent blood upon your selues, and upon this Citie, and upon the inhabitants thereof: etc. For of a truth the Lord hath sent me to speake all these wordes unto you.* Yea, let them not onely remember those

Jeremy 26:  
14:15



those words, but so also take admonition by them, that in the presence of God, they be not guiltie of high treason against our most Christian Sovereigne, against his Royall issue, and against the whole land, by provoking the Lord, to inflict such judgments upon all, as the wordes before mentioned doe insinuat. We are in their handes, ready without any resistance meekely to suffer any thing: but he that judgeth *righteous iudgment*, though he sit in the heavens, *will looke upon it*, and one day (as *Zechariah* in the like case sayd) *will requyre it*: as indeed then he did. 2 Chron: 34  
22:

Not withstanding, I am so farre from Prophecyng or wishyng any judgment to the whole land, (though I cannot but feare it) that I doe, and will earnestly pray, *spare (this) thy people o Lord, and giue not (this part of) thyne heritage into reproch etc.* Yea, I doe the more hope of mercy in sparyng us yet a while longer, because of the great *multitude of the righteous in the land*: and because perticularly of many that haue been and yet are (under Christ) *dressers of this the Lords vineyard*, that day and night (whiles many Prelats eate and drinke, and take their ease and pleasure) *doe pray the Lord of this his vineyard, to let it yet alone*, and to spare it a while longer. But for all this, whosoever shall procure the bloud of the meanest of us to be shed, (under whatsoever pretence) let them know that such bloud, shall cry louder in the eares of the Lord of Hosts, for vengeance upon the procurers therof, then ever we haue cryed in the eares, either of our most gracious Sovereigne (whom God long preferue in person, and in vprightnes of heart) or of the High Court of Parliament for Iustice. If *their shall be iudgment merciles, to him that sheweth no mercy*, what shall the portion be of the cruell & bloudthirsty? Verely, though *they cry, yet the Lord shall not heare them.* Ioel 2. 17  
Gen, 18, 26  
Luk. 13: 8  
James 2: 13  
Pro: 21: 13



Epist: 243.

As also they that put the Martyrs to death, missed of their purpose, so shall all bloud thirsty and ambitious Papall Prelats. *Sanguis martirum, semen Ecclesie. The bloud of Martyrs is the seed of the Church: and fecundi* (saith Calvin) *sunt martyrum cineres. The very ashes of Martyrs are fruitfull.* The truth may be oppressed, but it cannot be suppressed: yea the more it is oppressed, the more it shall *bud forth & spring*. If one of us in this cause should be put to death (though perhaps under colour of some other offence, by perverting of words, wresting of law or otherwise) yet for that on, the Lord can rayse up ten: yea, there is nothing that hath made, or doth make the cause of *Papall Prelats* more odious, and the reformation desired, more gracious and honorable (even with some that before the consideration of that which I now say, were of another minde) then the unjust, and especially the unmercifull proceedings of such *Papall Prelats*, against the seekers of reformation. Therefore in this case (as the Apostle exhorteth the *Philippians*) *we doe in nothing feare our adversaries*, because as to be our adversaryes in such respects, *is to them a token of perdition*, (if they repent not) so also, to be hated and persecuted by the Prelats, *is a like token to us of salvation, and that of God*. But beyng so confident, why doe we conceale our names to our writings? Because as *Christ Iesus*, notwithstanding all his heavenly fortitude without any defect, did for all that, oft tymes hide and with drawe himselfe, from the furie and rage of the *Priests, Scribes, and Pharises*, till his appoynted time was come, so doe we by this meanes, hyde our selues from the violence of some of our Prelats.

Philip: 1:28

To your conclusion I will answer litle, because it hath litle, that hath not been answered before. Wheras you say  
that



that *wordes are to be numbred to so great states*, I answer that words are not onely to be numbred, but also for the quality, truth, modesty, sincerity, and equity of them to be weighed and considered; which if you had doone, your whole labor had ben spared. If you did *greiue in your soule, to heare us complayne of our povertie*, why doe you by bitter rayling, false accusations, and most unjust & vnreasonable wresting of your antagonists words against all other Ministers of his sorte, *ad affliction to our affliction*: doe you not know, that by this circumstance, *David* amplyfied his complaints and deprecations against his aduersaries? Is this *to iudge wisely of the poore*? Whereas you wish us *to be ashamed of our feeding on shales, and haue at other mens treethers*, you mistake your marke. For this belongeth not to us, but to trencher chaplins, that gape after dead mens shoes, or liue in miserable hope of the livings of their brethren better then themselues, to be unjustly deprived: and that in the meane time wayte at their Masters table, till they haue sayd grace, and then sit down (if there be any roome) at the nether end, after all the meate served in. Who also are glad of ij s. vj d. or five shillings for examinynge some clarke presented, to a benefice, or that (which is worse) do now and then take a brybe, for allowing one to be sufficient for the Ministry, that is scarce fit to be a Ministers clarke, except onely to helpe on with the Surplice: who finally (for the most part) are every tawny coates companion, to play at cards, tables (perhaps also at dyce) and at bowles etc: Yea sometimes to drinke, quaffe, and all most *quid non*. All your reasons out of *Arretius*, against *popular contributions* (as you call them) and for set stipends and tythes I passe over with silence, because the author of the arguments hath commenced no sute against yon in this behalf.

Psal. 69 and  
109. 16  
Psal. 41. 1.



*408*  
Iob. 16. 3

behalf. Therefore I leaue you to fight herein, with your owne shadowe. Touching you *M. Powell*, as *Iob* sayd to *Eliphaz*, *What maketh thee bold so to answer?* Or as some other read it, *what provoketh you so to answer?* So truely I cannot but adinire the bitternes, sharpnes, and unrighteousnes of your pen (according as before I haue discovered the same) against one that hath used so great mildnes in all his Arguments. Notwithstanding remembering the fall of *Peter*, and the meanes therof, viz. His beyng in the high Priests Hall, and not forgetting his gracious repentance afterward, testified by many a salt teare, I doe the more pity your present state, by considering that provocation, which from other you haue had, so to write; and I doe the better also hope of your repentance. For though it be more advisedly to write an whole booke, then on the sodayne to speake a fewe wordes, yet in other respects, I will not compare your fault in thus wryting to the fall of *Peter*, as equall therunto: and if you had so fallen, yet would I not, neither might I, despaire of your rising. Only in unfained loue towards you, I do seriously exhort you, to take heed heerafter of any such service. Be not to readie, be not to ready, to be commanded such a worke by any Prelat whatsoever. You may perhaps haue some reward in the end of such paynes: (such as men can bestowe upon you) but looke more to that reward, that is in the right hand of the great master of all rewards. Remember well, what *Balaam* a forcerer refused at the hands of King *Balak*, beyng sent for by very honorable messengers, *to curse Israel*: yea, remember what a worthy answer he made, though himself

Nūb. 22. 18 were a most unworthy man. *If Balack would giue me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot goe beyond the word of the Lord my God, to doe lesse or more.* Yea, remember (I say once agayne



agayne) how constant he was in the sayd answer . For he chap. 24. 18  
repeated it afterward, when *Balak* was much provoked, be-  
cause he would not satisfie him in cursing of the *Isiaelits*,  
and threatned as much evill against him, as before he had  
promised and offred preferment . If such a person made  
such an answer to a King, and were so constant therein,  
should the Ministers of the Gospell be so easily comman-  
ded by lesse then Kings, to revile, and ( in some sorte ) to  
curse, so many worthy Ministers of Christ Iesus, which  
haue been valiant captaynes of his armyes against *Sathan*  
himselſe, and all his forces? Whatsoever you haue in this  
booke written against them, yet I appeale to your owne  
conscience for the contrary : yea you haue exprefly be-  
fore professed, that you hope they are *the Ministers of*  
*Christ Iesus, and in grace and favor with him.* Looke therfore  
heerunto in time, before you be too much hardened a-  
gainst him.

Touching the cause also it selfe, beware, yea, I say agayne  
beware, you sinne not for any worldly prefermēt, against  
your former knowledge . Pleade not better judgment  
now, then before you had . *Examine your owne heart* (as it Psal. 4. 4  
were) *upon your bed*, whether this plea be insincerity, or on-  
ly from regard and hope of some prelaticall advancement.  
The more knowledge, the more dangerous it is to fall a-  
way. A litle diseale is oft tymes the beginning of great sick-  
nes . Small hurtes also at the first neglected, growe in the  
end to greivous and incurable sores . *Remember Lots wife.*  
*Fynally remember from whence you are already fallen, and re-* Luc. 17. 32  
*pent, and doe your first works etc:* and let not the precious pro- Revel 2. 6.  
mises made to them in the word, that indure to the end,  
be forgottē. Wherof he that hath made them, make both  
you and me partaker, for his sake in whom they are made:  
to whom be all prayse and glory for evermore, *Amen.*



Pag	Lin	Errata	Correct.
4	17	what	what?
8	5	intended	intended?
9	3	supeftion	superftition
15	10	hage	haue
16	4	his	this
18	1	put out the,	
23	1	that loue	they loue,
31	12	they	some,
36	1	properly in matters that	
		belonging, that in matters properly	
		belonging:	
35	15	answer	order,
38	30	yeeld	yeeld to
42	20	and	us:
34	<del>21</del>	<del>was</del>	<del>were</del>
45	22	1 Pet.	2 Pet:
47	17	furtherers	furtherers
52	vlt.		ad thing,
56	6	foo:	foolish
	19	haue	haue made
57	<del>30</del>	<del>stamps</del>	<del>stumps</del>
58	29	them	then,
59	<del>4</del>	<del>put out two</del>	
61	<del>7</del>	<del>extraor:</del>	<del>extraordinarily</del>
64	<del>31</del>	<del>doth</del>	<del>doth he</del>
80	14	vi	vis
81	24	and	in
87	28	fo	fo to be
91	1	and	an
94	9	crowe	crowne
95	18	depravation	deprivatiō
	28	depraved	deprived

Pag	Lin	Errata	Correct.
98	9	duce	due
	<del>29</del>	<del>tenex</del>	<del>tenex</del>
106	11	performed	prefer,
	1,24	the,for he:	1:25 ther,for his
111	29	many	in any
119	18	exrella	exprella
121	11	he	he that
123	28	appertune	opportune
124	18	and	and be
<del>126</del>	<del>22</del>	<del>so</del>	<del>of</del>
129	17	the	that,
	21	therfore	but
130	28	this	the next,
	<del>29</del>	<del>should</del>	<del>shall</del>
131	3	obedience	obedienceto
		mens precepts.	
133	26	Ministers	members
134	5	deffer	differ
<del>136</del>	<del>9</del>	<del>feat</del>	<del>feat is</del>
140	3	cōformitans,	cōformitās?
	1:5,so,for	so haue.	
142	25	by	and by
147	27	promises	premisses
149	27	as	as are
150	22	Ethnicks	Ethiks
	vlt.	can	cannot
151	29	but	and
152	2	concluded	excluded
	16	herein	herein repēt
154	16	14	4
	17	first	fift
156	7	we	they

*Marginall Notes.*

pag. 48. lin. 31 & Prov. 6. 19 pag 49 l 7, John 9 30. 31, pag 115. l 25: Cant 5. 7.  
 pag 131. l 16. Luk 10. 7 for Luk 18. 7. & l. 25 before over, ad that.  
 Pag 132: l 17, Luk 9: 2 for Luke 9. 26.



C 3522 X  
21178 SL

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE  
**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

---

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION